

K S L

Dissenters no Schismatics.

A
Second Letter

T O
Mr. Robert Burscough,
About his

Discourse of SCHISM.

Being a Reply to
His Pretended Vindication thereof.

WHEREIN
Catholick Unity is considered, the Dissenters
further cleared from the Charge of Schism,
the Ordination of their Ministers again
justified, and the Case about Ceremonies
and Separation more fully argued.

By the same Hand.

Veritas Victrix.

*If Phaetons drive the Chariot of the Sun, the World
will be soon on Fire: I mean such in the Church,
whose Brains, like the Unicorns, run out into the
length of the Horn: Such who have more Fury than
Zeal, and yet more Zeal than Knowledge or Mode-
ration. Stillingf. Iren. p. 47.*

L O N D O N, Printed for J. Robinson, at the
Golden-Lion in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1702.

43.

4

6

238.



A Second Letter to Mr. Robert Burfcough, in Vindication of the First, &c.

A Preface to Mr. R. B.

SIR,

I Have read what you call a *Vindication of a Discourse of Schism*, which was address'd to the Dissenters, who conform'd before the Toleration, and have since withdrawn themselves from the Communion of the Church of England, in Answer to a Letter lately published against it: Wherein you have done much more than enough to shew the World your Resentment of it; and am sorry to find you in a Transport so unbecoming that Character of Moderation and Learning you would pretend to, and the more because I have been the Occasion of it; but how justly, is what must now be examin'd and consider'd.

At what time your *Discourse of Schism* began to appear in open light in 1699, I cannot tell, but it was not till February 1700, that it was brought to my hand, when I was earnestly desir'd to make some Reply to it, which, when I had read it, I was prevail'd with, to take the few spare hours I had to do. But finding that in it which David complain'd of in another case, *Psal. 55. 21. The words of his Mouth were smoother than butter, but War was in his heart; his words were softer than Oyl, yet were they drawn Swords.* I therefore thought it my

(II)

Duty to endeavour to prevent the Mischief it might possibly do to some, who are more easily influenc'd by the Air of Flattering and Deceitful Words, than by the power of forcible Arguments. And your way of Addressing your Discourse to the Multitude of *Dissenters*, who conform'd before the Toleration, &c. gave me the proper occasion of putting my Letter into that *Form*, as written in the Names of those whom you had address'd, and to which it seem'd not so agreeable to set a single Name; tho' I could not hope by this means to conceal my self, as you opprobriously suggest.

If you found my Style in that Letter too pungent, I must confess, that no Man is apt to be so sensible of the Sharpness of his own Teeth, as he that is bitten by them, and which you have reason to believe, is as much your own Case as mine: But if you consider the Provocation you had given, you will find very little reason you had to be offended at it. The declar'd Design of your *Discourse* was, to convert us to your Party, i. e. to what you call the *Church of England*, on a Specious pretence of *Charity to our Souls*, wherein if you prevail'd not (as you were not like to do with many of us) you were

pleas'd to tell us in plain terms,
Disc. of Schism, that we were guilty of such a *Schism*,
p. 73. that, persisting in it, we can do no-

thing that can qualify us for Commu-
nion with any part of the *Catholick Church*, and there-
fore in that state must be excluded from the Whole.

And if we are not of the Body, (as you would have us believe you have prov'd) you do not see how we can be united to the Head. From an Al-

ibid. lusion of St. Cyprian, you conclude us under an impossibility of Salvation. For if

Page 74. a Person could escape, who was out of the Ark of Noah, then shall one escape also who is out of the Church: By which you must mean your Church

of

(III)

of England, and out of it too, just as we are out of it, by our Nonconformity to its Ceremonies, and External Modes of Discipline and Worship, or else you do but trifle with us. From Ignatius, you tell us, *We are depriv'd of the bread of God; and that those that follow us shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. That our setting up Opposite Churches and Officers is Impious, Adulterous, and Sacrilegious, and that we are herein guilty of the Sin of Korah and his Complices. That our Pastors have no just Title to the Ministry; but are Sacrilegious Intruders, Seducers of the People, and no better than Thieves and Murderers; which is the main business of your Third Section. Yea, that they mock God to serve their own Turns: They profane the Sacred Function, and make a trifle of the Sin: They are Troublers of the People, and the Subverters of Souls: They are plain Impostors, and Usurpers of the Broad Seal of Heaven: The Disturbers of all Right, and the Phaetons that burn up the Spiritual World. They intrude themselves into a Trust which was not committed to them, and therefore to be reck'ned amongst those that are branded as profligately wicked, and guilty of impudent Falsification. And did you not all along throughout your Discourse, represent us as some of the worst of Criminals, not worthy nor fit to be tolerated, and load us with all the blackest aggravations that you found the foulest guilt of Schism, either by the Fathers or any Others, charged with, beyond what is pleasant or needful for me to recite, while your own Writings stand as the Open Records of it. By all which you seem'd to go about to terrify, rather than to perswade us into Conformity. And now, Sir, you having thus endeavour'd to fire the House upon us, is it just or reasonable for you to blame me for the heat that your own Flames had rais'd? I confess I am not Stoick enough to be*

Ibid.

Page 77.

78. 82.

&c.

Ibid.

P. 110.

(IV)

utterly unconcern'd in such a Case. Yet had your Bitterness been only private and personal Reflections, or on a Subject of a lower Nature, and private Opinion, I should have slighted it, or have answer'd in a cooler manner : But in the defence of the Great Truths of God, and the Rights and Priviledges of the Gospel, I ought not to be *Luke-warm*. And yet as great and as just as the heat was, I was careful to pay you all the personal Respect that was due to your Character, and was never severe with you, further than the particular Subject we were upon offered the just Occasion.

And now after Sixteen Months from the Date of my *Letter*, you are come forth with a *Vindication of that your Discourse of Schism*, wherein I humbly confess you have by far outdone me, in that sort of Learning, wherein I am not ambitious of imitating, or contending with you, but which indeed is easier to do than to forbear. I see 'tis an hard matter for a Man that hath been accustomed to *Dictating*, and whose Words have been always taken for *Oracles* by his Admirers, to suffer a Contradiction. Should all the foul Language, the nauseous Repartees, the disingenuous Reflections, the false Accusations, the extravagant Impertinencies, and wilful Wrestings of my Words, which, with such Supercilious disdain, every Page of your pretended *Vindication* is bespatter'd with, be thrown together into one heap, I think it would look but oddly upon you, and contribute very little to the Glory or Success of your Undertaking, in the Opinions of any impartial Judges. Sir, had you walk'd by St. *Austin's* Rule to *Petilian*, as you have so amply *Vind. p. 14.* quoted it, you had shewn the World more of a *Christian*, and more of a *Wise Man* ; but I see 'tis easier to bind up a Burden for others, than to bear it ones self, and harder to practice good Rules, than to prescribe them. Had you

you not been very fore, you would never have winc'd at this rate : But all this Burlesque of your angry Pen, (which is the greater part of your Book) I shall lay aside as calmly as I can, as forreign to the Questions in debate, and unworthy of Recognition ; and as far as I am but personally concern'd in it, do heartily forgive it, and pitty the Impotency of the Passion that drew it from you.

But before I come to attend you on the Questions in Dispute between us, give me leave to take a little notice of some things which you charge me with in your *Preface*, and by which you endeavour to represent me in as ill a Character as you can, as if the ruin of my Arguments did wholly depend upon that of my Reputation, which indeed is a Method much older than your self, and which the Enemies of the Truth have been always careful to practice.

I. You charge me of *Boasting* that I *had given you very much in a very little.* *Pref. p. IV.* Μέγιστον ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ, which was in truth so far from a Boast, in the way that I used it, that it was only an Excuse for saying so little (which yet I thought was enough, and more than you could well answer) to justify our Ministers in Preaching the Gospel of Christ to us, even as many as will hear them, which was one of the greatest Fundamentals of the Controversie, and to which you have yet given no satisfactory Answer.

II. You accuse me of *Railing*, and representing you as our *inveterate Enemy*, that would fill the Prisons with us, as with *Thieves and Robbers.* Tho' I never suggested this as your personal Intentions or Desires, but as the natural consequent of your Arguings with us, and Accusations of us. Did you not charge us as guilty of that which was worse than Murder or

Idolatry? And set us forth as the most execrable and hopeless Villains on the face of the Earth; as the worst of Thieves and Traitors, and much viler than Drunkards or Adulterers, and endeavour'd to cut us off from the Mercy and Benefit of the Laws and Government under which we live? Let any one that understands Sense, but read over your *Discourse of Schism*, and tell me, if I have herein wrong'd you: And is not the charging us with the *Crimes*, an exposing us to the *Punishments* due to them? Therefore let the load of *Infamy* rest where you say you will be content it should, if this be true.

III. You accuse me of *casting Reproach*
 Page V. *upon Persons of the greatest Worth, when they come in my way, and are not of my mind.*

For which you produce my words, That it had been better for the Church of *England*, if her Reformers, in respect of Wisdom, Faith, Patience, Zeal and Self-denial, had not been too *Ordinary*. This you call a vilifying of our Reformers, which I think the best of Themselves would not have call'd so. To make Comparisons I know you will not like, neither do I do it with any personal Reflections. We bless God with you, for the *Zeal* that did, at that time, appear in them, at least the leading part of them, and for the good Success of their *Zeal*. But the Difficulties under which so great a Work as this laboured in those days, in respect of the main Body of the Clergy, as well as of the People; and the Sweetness of that Worldly Grandeur which they had had so long in Possession, offered them such Temptations, as required a measure of Wisdom, Faith, Patience, Zeal and Self-denial, that was very Extraordinary, and which is too rarely found in its Eminency in Dignify'd Persons.

IV. You

(VII)

IV. You charge me with *vili-
fying their Work*, and with saying,
*That their Reformation ought ra-
ther to be call'd Accommodation
with the Church of Rome.* Sir,
This is not very fairly quoted;
I was there only speaking of
the *Liturgy*, which Dr. Be-
veridge had bestow'd such Pa-
negyricks upon, and my words
were these, How the *Liturgy*
was compil'd in that juncture of
the Reformation, or rather Ac-
commodation, the true History
of these times would inform you:

So that the Accommodation which I mention'd,
had a particular respect only to the Reformed
Liturgy, and not to the Reformation in general, as
you represent me: And I there farther told you,
that to say that this (that is, the *Liturgy*, under
which all the Rites and Ceremonies of your Church
are comprehended) consider'd as an External Mode,
or Instrument of Divine Worship, and of Mens own
composing, *was that which was defended, or confirmed
by the Martyrdom of many, or of any,* was the Doctor's
great Mistake and yours too, and in the same Opi-
nion I must continue till I am better convinc'd of
the contrary: Yea, those are indeed the foulest
Traducers of these Holy Men, who make them but
Martyrs to their own Inventions, and such as Sa-
crific'd their Blood to the Models of Mens com-
posing, and that in things which themselves con-
fess'd to be *Indifferent*. Let others judge then who
hath vilified them, you or I. Yet how far their
Reformation was really an Accommodation, will
appear beyond Contradiction, by their own Con-
fessions and Complaints, and the undeniable Records
of that Revolution. To transcribe all that offers
it

Ibid

*See the Copy of the
Proceedings of some
Worthy and Learned
Divines, appointed by
the Lords to meet at
the Bishop of Lincoln's
in Westminster, &c.
Printed 1641. Sub-
scribed by the Archbi-
shop of Armagh, Bishop
of Lincoln, Dr. Pri-
deaux, Dr. Ward, Dr.
Brownrigg, Dr. Feat-
ly, Dr. Hacket.*

(VIII)

it self from the authentick History of these times, in evidence of the truth of what I have said, would be too large and laborious a Service, I will take up here but a few of many, and those from such hands, as no true Son of the Church of England can have any pretence of Reason to except against.

First, If you please to consult your own Heylin, he will tell you, *That he cannot reckon the Death of King Edward the Sixth for an Infelicity to the Church of England: That not to press too much at once upon the People, it was thought fit to smoothe the way to the Reformation, by setting out some Preparatory Injunctions, all which was done to this intent, that the People in all places, being prepar'd by little and little, might with more ease, and less Opposition, admit the Total Alteration, which was intended in due time to be introduced. That some Godly Bishops, and other Learned and Religious Men (the same that made the Liturgy) were employ'd in the Castle of Windsor by the King's Command, to consult about one Uniform Order, for the Administring of the Holy Communion; and they agreed on such a Form and Order, as might comply with the Intention of the King and Parliament, without giving any just Offence to the Romish Party. That when Queen Elizabeth came to the Crown, she retained such as had been of Privy-Council unto Queen Mary (her Sister) to be of her Council. And in the Parliament, which altered, and again imposed the Book of Common-Prayer, great care was taken for expunging all such Passages in it, as might give any Scandal or Offence to the Popish Party. And tho' by Calvin's means, some Reformation had been made in the Second Liturgy, in King Edward's time, now it is returned back into the First Form, and by Compliances, the Book was made so passable among the Papists, that they repair'd unto our Parish-Churches without Scruple. That things abolished by King Edward*

the

(IX)

the Sixth, and revived by Queen Mary, were by Queen Elizabeth retained as formerly in her Father's time, for which she receiv'd both Thanks and Honour from her very Enemies, that is to say, the Papists.

If this one so full and unexceptionable Testimony be not sufficient to prove what I said in my Letter of the Accommodation of Queen Elizabeth's Reformation, you may take one more from another, very true too, and Famous in the Church of England, Dr. Fuller, who in his Church-History tells you, ' That as careful Mothers and Nurses, on condition they can get their Children to part with Knives, are contented to let them play with Rattles: Thus (saith he) the Reformers permitted ignorant People still to retain some of their fond and foolish Customs, that they might remove from them the most dangerous and destructive Superstitions. That in the Year 1585, the Parliament began to correct Ecclesiastical Abuses; but the Queen being Semper eadem, would let nothing of moment be alter'd in the Church-Discipline. That in the Year 1587, the House of Commons presented unto the House of Lords a Petition; That (among other Grievances) Ministers might not be troubled for the Omission of some Rites prescrib'd in the Book of Common-Prayer. And the Lord Grey wonder'd that her Majesty would in this matter make choice to confer with those who were all Enemies to Reformation, because it touch'd their Free-holds.

Is not this yet enough to convince you how matters were carried, and by whom, in this Glorious Reformation you boast of, and how far it was from being perfect, or agreeable to the Desires of the Best, the Wisest and most Learned of those that were then Instruments in it; as one that was Friend enough to Prelacy, once wrote to Mr. Hooker, when he was on his Ecclesiastical Polity. ' It may be remembered (says he) that at the first, the greatest part of the Learned in the Land were either eagerly affected, or favourably inclin'd to that way [of Non-conformity];

The

'The Books then written, savour'd for the most part of
'the Disciplinary Stile, it sounded every where in the
'Pulpits, and in the common Phrase of Mens Speech;
'and the contrary Party began to fear they had taken a
'wrong Course. Sir, Will you not yet see, that the
Non-conformity for which we are thus damn'd by
you for Schismatics, is altogether as old as the Pro-
testant Reformation it self, and that not as the
Faction of a small Party, but as the Sense and earnest
Desire of the best and most valuable part of the Sub-
jects, as appears not only by what hath been now said,
but by the many *Addresses* and humble *Petitions*, that
were then made and presented to the *Queen*, to the
Parliament, and to the *Convocation*, by the Com-
monalty and many of the Clergy of the Nation.

Again I might refer you to Dr. *More*,
Myst. Iniq. who in his *Mystery of Iniquity*, speaking
p. 468. of the Church of England, says thus, 'She

'out of a Spirit of Charity and tender Kind-
'ness, has in some things, in themselves Indifferent,
'humbly condescended to Symbolize with that Lapsed
'Lady of Rome, to bring off her abused Paramours to
'the pure Worship of God. And our Church (says he) does
'not cease to use this charitable Courtship and sweet Con-
'descension towards them still; to win them off to such a
'Worship as is every way as Graceful as their own.

I should tire my self, should I transcribe all that
offers from some of the best and most unsuspected
Authors on this Head: I shall at present mention
but this one more, and that of the very Learned

Bishop *Stillington*. 'The same Temper
Irenic. (says he) having spoken of the French
p. 122, &c. Churches, 'was us'd by our Reformers in the

'composing our Liturgy in reference to the
'Papists, to whom they had then an especial eye, as being
'the only Party then appearing, whom they desir'd to
'draw into their Communion, by coming as near them as
'they well and safely could. And certainly these Holy
Men,

(XI)

Men, who did seek by any means to draw in others, at such a distance from their Principles, as the Papists were, did never intend by what they did for that end, to exclude any truly tender Consciences from their Communion. And to this purpose he there goes on. By this time I hope it appears, that I did not wrong the Reformation, in what I said of its Accommodation, for which you are so offended with me. But now to follow you on in your Preface.

V. You charge me with speaking *what I know to be false*, because when you had granted us, *that they grievously offend, who add new Articles to that one Faith (i. e. Doctrine of Faith) delivered to the Saints, for which they must earnestly contend, or take away from it such as are already reveal'd; or otherwise deprave it by a mixture of Falsehoods; and so far as they do so, we ought to depart from them, and not betray the Truth in compliance with them.* I gave you thanks for this, and told you, that this is all that we and our Teachers have been so long wrestling and waiting on the Church of England for. *This, you say, I knew to be false, and to demonstrate it to be so, you say, you shall only need to recite my own words two Pages before: For (say you) speaking of the Ceremonies, he says, that these are the only matter of debate [for in debate] between us. And upon this your Critical Demonstration, you triumph a great triumphing, as on one that is convicted by his own Testimony. But,*

1. Your Charity might have observ'd, that it was but few Lines before, that I had said, That External Communion with the Church of England in its present State, and in all its Rites and Ceremonies, is the Main thing in Dispute betwixt us: And then your Learning might have inform'd you, how commonly the Main, or the Chief thing, and the Whole, the All, and the Only thing, are used indifferently, not only in the ordinary and looser way of speaking, but in the

the Holy Scriptures too, which I would not have them therefore, for my sake, to charge with *Lies and Self-contradictions*.

2. Your *Wisdom* should first have consider'd the full Extent of your own Concession, unless perhaps you granted more than you were aware. Did you not expressly grant, *That they grievously offend, who add new Articles to that One Faith delivered to the Saints, and that so far as they do so we ought to depart from them?* Now are not the 39 *Articles* a Summary of the Doctrine of the Faith of the Church of England, and is not every thing therein contain'd propos'd as Matter of Christian Doctrine and Faith, and so to be believ'd, and accordingly practiced? And are not all the Rites and Ceremonies of your Church contain'd in General under the 20th Article, and something more particularly under the 36th, *Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers?* So that if all that lies in Controversy betwixt us be comprehended in that *Systeme*, which you have made and declar'd the *Articles of your Faith*, and would, as such, impose on our Belief and Practice, had I not reason to say, that what you had so freely conceded, was all that we desir'd, till the Case be fairly try'd and determined, Whether this be not the *Adding of New Articles to the Faith taught us in the Holy Scriptures, or a Depraving it by a mixture of Falshood*. And now, Sir, if you please, you may consider what it is that you have hereby *Demonstrated*.

VI. You complain of me for *Exclaiming against the Bishops, for their not hearkening to the Apostles Words, nor walking by the Apostles Rules*. *ibid.* That if the People had continued in your Communion, they must have had *Wolves instead of Shepherds set over them*, which you confess was only suggested, not plainly asserted by me. And that *Men of that Tribe preach Faith and Repentance, Charity, Humility,*

(XIII)

Humility, Sobriety, Continency and Mortification to others, but not to themselves; but this you do not say, that I mean of all the Tribe, tho' you cannot deny it to be shamefully true (tho' not of your Self, yet) of too many others of the Sons of your Church. And in how forelorn a case are those Multitudes of Souls that are deliver'd up to the Conduct of such Guides, and who have no other way of Redress but by forsaking their Communion? Yet so very tender are you, that we must not so much as complain, for fear of encouraging Atheists, Deists and Papists, as if their encouragement did proceed more from our just Complaint of it, than from their open and unpunished Guilt and Practice. This Remark of yours might better have been spar'd.

VII. You accuse me of not *Expressing a due respect to the Secular Powers.* Be- p. VIII. cause I had said, That the Penal Laws made and executed on us for our Non-conforming to all the Impositions of the Church of England, were *Sharp Thorns*, too often arbitrarily and spitefully executed. And tho' you confess they were sometimes so executed, yet to call those Laws *Sharp Thorns*, you say, becomes not a good Subject. Sir, Were not these the Laws by which about Two Thousand Ministers of good Learning, peaceable Principles, and unblameable Lives, were in one day turn'd out both of their Offices and Benefices, without any regard to their Persons or Families, or any Provision made for them, so much as Liberty to get their Bread by teaching a School? Were not these the Laws that banish'd us, under severe Penalties, Five miles from our own Homes, and all Places in which we had ever serv'd as Ministers, that we might have none but Strangers to converse with? Were not these the Laws that Confiscated our Goods, rifl'd our Houses, and fill'd the Prisons with us? Which destroy'd the Health and shortned the
the

(XIV)

the Lives of many of us? And that not for any Riots, Treasons, Immoralities, or Seditions, that we were guilty of, but for Preaching the Word of God, and Praying, according to the Duty of the Office, to which we had been solemnly dedicated and devoted, and with those few that had courage enough to make such an adventure with us? Were not the Statutes that had been made in former Reigns against *Papists*, turn'd with their sharpest edge against us *Protestants*? Was not both City and Country fill'd with Spies and Informers to watch us in every corner, and the rage of most of the Leading Party, both of the Clergy and Others, flaming against us, and very many enriching themselves with our Spoils? What Tragical particular accounts will the History of the late Reigns give you of these things, both in *England*, *Scotland* and *Ireland*? Yet now to say there was any *Sharpness* in all this, you tell us, becomes not a good Subject; so admirable an *Arcanum* is your Spirit of Charity. What a Comfortable Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, and how Edifying would this have been to the *Fellows* in *Magdalen Colledge*, or to the *Bishops* in the *Tower*, or to Those that gave the *Prince of Orange* that Solemn Imploring Invitation to come over to assert and defend their ravished Rights and Liberties, against that Regal Power, to which they had sworn Allegiance, when they apprehended it too strong for them. And would not the poor Protestants in *France*, and in all the other Persecuted Churches of the Reformation, to whom this Doctrine agrees, as well as to us, admire the heavenly Charity that you express in it? Was it not enough that we bore all with Patience, but may we not, without further danger, call it *Sharp*? No, you tell us, it was but a *Seeming Rigour*, and that but in the Opinion of some. Had it been your own Case, you would not have taken it well to have been told so.

B^W

(XV)

But to prove the Justice of these Penal Laws, and the Unreasonableness, yea, the Disloyalty of our calling them *Sharp*, you pretend to Inform us, That some Doctrines pre-judicial to Civil Government, being advanc'd by the Presbyterians, and confirm'd by the Practices of some of that Self, it was thought fit, that a stricter hand should be kept upon them: But what these Doctrines or Practices of the Presbyterians were, and by whom Preach'd and Practiced, you cannot, or will not tell us: Only that in Queen Elizabeth's time, Serjeant Puckering represented them to the Parliament as Persons that acted the same part more openly, which the Jesuites did closely; and that however in other things they pretended to be at War with the Jesuites, yet in debasing their Princes Authority they were agreed. Here's a general and indefinite Charge, or Report of a Charge of Persons and Things for about a Hundred years ago, which, till it be particularly prov'd, must in equity and reason pass for a slander. Yet were it as true of the Presbyterians of that Age, as it is notoriously false, we cannot understand by what Justice the Guilt and Punishment should be entail'd on us, unless it could be prov'd that we have been personally guilty of the same Crimes, which any ones Charity but yours would think that Forty years Observation and Provocation were sufficient to make the Experiment on us.

But by a long Quotation out of Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation, of the candid Relation (as you call it) of Secretary Wallingham, concerning those that were called Puritans in the days of Queen Elizabeth, you open the great Sore, where all the Anguish lies. And tell us, That there were those among the Puritans that inweigh'd against Pluralities, Non-residence, [yea, and the Immoralities and Ignorance of the Clergy too,] that refus'd the Use of

You should first
have answer'd Mr.
Lock's Three Let-
ters of Toleration.

(XVI)

some Ceremonies and Rites as Superstitious ; yea, that call'd in question the Superiority of Bishops, and pretended to a Democracy in the Church, on which account their Course was perceiv'd to be dangerous and very popular. Yet this was not all, but there issued from them, that affirm'd the Consent of the Magistrate was not to be attended, when under a pretence of a Confession, they combin'd themselves by Classes and Subscriptions : When they descended into that vile and base means of defacing the Government of the Church, by ridiculous Pasquils : When they began to make many Subjects in doubts to take Oaths : When they began to vaunt of their Strength, and Number of their Partizans and Followers, and to use Comminations. Then it appear'd to be no more Zeal, no more Conscience, but meer Faction and Division. And tho' therefore the State was compell'd to hold somewhat a harder hand to restrain them than before, yet was it with as great Moderation as the peace or state of the Church could permit. Now from all this give me leave to observe,

1. That 'tis an easy matter to find a Stone to throw at a Dog, or to form Accusations, and aggravate the Faults of such as stand in the way of Mens ambitious Designs, and to trample on those over whom they have by their Princes Favour gotten the Ascendent, tho' it be very Unchristian and Ungenerous so to do. And as for Secretary *Walsingham*, who stood in so good a Post in that Queens Service, nothing could be expected from him, but what was agreeable to the prevailing Humour of the Times, and the Settlement of himself in his Court-Favour, so that his Testimony hath too much of the Byas to be of any great significaney in this case.

2. That it was in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time that the Court-Party of the Church of England was so griev'd at these things, when the Protestant Reformation began first to take root in these Kingdoms,

after

(XVII)

after that short Dawning of it that appear'd under the Reign of *Edward* the VI. and when *Rome* and Hell did their utmost, by all means, and in all Shapes of Religious Zeal and Pretensions to destroy the Reformation in its Infancy, and therefore not to be wonder'd at, nor yet to be defended, as to any of the ill Designs or Extravagancies of the Open or Secret Enemies of it.

3. That here is nothing prov'd against the Accus'd either in Doctrine or Practice, that was prejudicial to the Honour, Authority, or Safety of the Civil Government. 'Twas what you call the *Church of England* that made all the Roar against these Men, as it doth still against us. And all the slanderous Accusations that could be rais'd, all the Jealousies that could be suggested, and the flattering Insinuations that could be practiced, were craftily and zealously us'd to draw the Civil Powers to their Church-Party, and which they had then the Advantage above others to do.

4. That whatever Errours or Extravagancies any of those that then separated from the *Church of England*, or declar'd their Dislike of many things in it, were, thro' Mistakes of Judgment, or Prejudices form'd and confirm'd in them by Episcopal Rigours and Persecutions, or any unseen hand the Agents of the *Church of Rome* had with the Weaker and more Passionate of them; and whatever Erroneous or Schismatical Doctrines were vented by any of them, they are all laid to the Charge of the *Presbyterians*, tho' never so far from the Guilt of these things. And against these it is that the Cry is still made, as Enemies to the Government, which is as full of Justice and Fair-dealing, as Flattering and Tricking is of Honesty.

But to set these things in a truer Light, it would be necessary to give the Reader some short Abridgment of the History of these Times, and which I

(XVIII)

would do, had it not been already done by other hands. Yet for the Vindication of the Truth, and the satisfaction of such as have not yet read these things, I shall here insert a brief Synopsis of the chief Matters of Fact, that concern our present Controversie.

In the latter end of the Reign of King *Henry VIII.* there began to be some Foundation laid

Vid. Hist. of Nonconform. for a Church-Reformation, tho' more upon a private Quarrel with the Bishop

of *Rome*, than from any hearty Love to the Thing it self, and consisted only in suppressing of Monasteries, and the Pope's Supremacy, and all Appeals to *Rome*, and Printing the Bible in *English*, which was all done on Politick Reasons of Court; but in Doctrine, Worship or Discipline, there was little or no Reformation, as appears by the *Six Articles* on which, *Mrs. Anne Askew*, *Lambert*, and several others, suffer'd Martyrdom. So that *Cranmer*, *Latimer* and *Ridley*, and most of the chief Instruments of the Reformation, were at first but *Lutherans*, and no wonder then, that the first Reformed Liturgy retain'd so much of the old *Papish Prayers*, *Rites and Ceremonies*, and which were continued in *Queen Elizabeth's* Reformation, partly by the old *Lutheran* Principles, which some of the most Zealous Reformers of this time adher'd to, and partly for the great Reverence they had for *Cranmer*, *Latimer*, and those others, who had suffer'd Martyrdom under *Queen Mary*.

When King *Edward* his Successor came to the Throne, who engag'd in this Work on a better Principle, and would doubtless have carried it to a good degree of Perfection, had not the Stiffness of some Leading Church men, and the Shortness of that invaluable Life, prevented him; the whole Nation being, as it were, born at once, and just come out of that dismal State of Popery, and so few

(XIX)

in the Ministry that were fit either to Pray or Preach, both the *Liturgy* and *Homilies* (such as they could then provide) were appointed as needful Helps, and which gave the Rulers the Occasion of restraining Preaching only to such as should be Licensed, to secure them from returning to their old Idolatry.

This *Service-Book* was first set forth 2 & 3 *Edw. VI.* and afterwards corrected 3 & 4 *Edw. VI.* On the first Edition of that Book, there was no Nonconformist to direct an Act against, besides the *Papists*. But on the second Edition, there appear'd a considerable Party of Opposers, among whom were no less Men than *Miles Coverdale*, *John Hooper*, *Mr. Rogers*, and others, who having fled beyond-Sea, upon the *Six Articles*, and now return'd into *England*, and finding how very defective the Reformation was, and how many Popish Ceremonies, Gestures and Vestments, were still retain'd, could not conceal their Dissatisfaction, but refus'd to comply; But *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, who by Politick Compliances had weather'd out that Storm, endeavour'd to defend them under the Pretences of Antiquity and Decency. Upon this Remark, the present Bishop of *Sarum*, in his *Observations on Ridley's Letter to Hooper*, puts this Objection; 'But (says he) when the Clergy of the Church of England saw that good and great Men, and the glorious Martyrs of Jesus Christ, such as Hooper was, were offended with these Ceremonies, they should have us'd their utmost endeavours to have gotten them discharg'd by Law, as they were impos'd by Law, and not have kept them to remain a standing Offence, and a perpetual Stumbling-block to all others of Hooper's mind. So that by the way you may observe, it was not in defence of the Ceremonies that these good Men suffer'd Martyrdom; nay, by *Ridley's Letter to Hooper*, when they were both Prisoners for the Truth in the *Marian* Perse-

(a 3)

Persecution, it appears, that he was so far from dying for them, tho' he had once contended for them, that now he would not own them; but acknowledges it was his Simplicity to urge them, but *Hooper's* Wisdom to reject them. And in the same

Right Reverend Prelate's *Exhortation to* Page 27. *Peace and Union*, he says, 'God be thanked for it, there is an end put to all Persecution in Matters of Religion: And that the first and chief Right of Humane Nature, of following the Dictates of Conscience in the Service of God, is secur'd to all Men amongst us, and that we are freed, I hope for ever, of all the Remnants of the worst part of Popery, I mean, the Spirit of Persecution. I wish, Sir, you would compare these things a little with your Spirit of Charity.

Yet notwithstanding the Contentions that were rais'd about these Matters of Ceremony in the days of that most Excellent Young Prince, the business of Church-Government and Worship never came to a thorow Legal Establishment in his days, nor were any of the Protestant Ministers silenced or suspended on that account, only *Hooper*, for protesting against them, was, contrary to the King's Mind and Request, by the over-ballancing Power of the Bishops, committed to Prison; which was a sure, but sad Omen to the succeeding Age, of the dire Effects of a Protestant Bigottry. But the untimely death of that Good King, and the immediate Succession of his Sister *Mary*, soon put an end to these Contests in *England*, and began a new and more Tragical Scene of Persecution, during her five Years Reign. In which time, to avoid the Bloody Persecution, many fled beyond-Sea, and there began to settle, some at *Basil*, some at *Geneva*, some at *Strasburgh*, some at *Embsen*, some at *Frankfort*, and other places. Those at *Geneva* followed the Reformed Order of that Church, so did those at *Frankfort*, till Dr. *Cox*

(one of those that had compil'd our *English Common-Prayer-Book*, and was too fond of his own Doings) came over with a new Party from *England*, and brought in his *English Service-Book* into the Church of *Frankfort*, and by his Arts, turn'd out their Pastor Mr. *Knox*, and by malicious Accusations, drove him and a considerable Party that clave to him, to *Geneva*. Thus it appear'd from the beginning, even in that common Sanctuary where these Exiles fled for Refuge, how conducive your Ceremonies have been to the good Order and Union of the Church.

Vid. *Troubles*
at *Frankfort*,
P. 44, 45.

On Queen *Elizabeth's* Accession to the Throne, the Refugees from all Parts return'd to their Country, in hope of some ease after all their sore Travels and Disappointments; And of these were they, who, having seen the Reformed Worship, Order and Discipline of the Churches in *Switzerland* and *Germany*, and at *Geneva*, were the chief Fathers of the Nonconformity in *England*, as some have affirm'd; and those who had never been abroad, nor seen the further Progress that other Churches had made in the Reformation, were the great Sticklers for Conformity to the more Ceremonious *English Reformation*, as if Nonconformity had no better Foundation, nor other Original, than the Fashions of other Churches; but that this was not true, appears *de facto*, both by *Cox* and his Gang, who had been Travellers, and by many of those who had weather'd out their Persecutions at home, and had not travelled.

In the First Year of Queen *Elizabeth*, several Acts were passed for the reviving the Reformation begun by King *Henry VIII.* and King *Edward VI.* establishing, among other things, a *Uniformity of Prayers*, but these Acts passed without the Consent of one Bishop, who were then all *Papists*, and Enemies to the Reformation. So that this first Establishment

wanted one of the *Three States*, at least the *Lords Spiritual*, to form it into a Law.

In the Second Year of Queen *Elizabeth*, 'twas her Care to fill up the Bishopricks with Protestant Bishops, who were mostly such as had been *Exiles*, or liv'd private lives in *England*, during the Persecutions. These Bishops, knowing what it was to suffer for Conscience-sake themselves, were for several Years very favourable to Nonconformists, without any Persecutions on that account, or any Subscriptions requir'd, by Legal Authority; nor was the use of all the Liturgy and Ceremonies generally urged; And this kept all in quiet for some Years, tho' a large Petition was presented to the Queen, *Anno 1561*, the Third Year of her Reign, by multitudes of Hands, wherein they complain'd of insufficient and *Scandalous Ministers*, of *Pluralists* and *Non-Residents*, &c. Yea, two of the former Protestant Bishops, as *Coverdale* of *Exon*, and *Gilpen* of *Carlisle*, refus'd to be restor'd to their Dignities under so imperfect a Reformation. The People at this time enjoy'd the Labours of their Godly Nonconforming Ministers, and the Ministers, for the most part, scrupled not to use some parts of the *Common-Prayers*; and the Bishops did not exact the use of the more offensive parts of it, nor of the Ceremonies, and very few were Sufferers, unless by some particular *Officials*, who were busier than others. And thus it continued, in a good measure, till after the Death of Archbishop *Parker*, and *Grindall* his Successor, who dyed about the fifth Year of the Queen.

In the Year 1583, Dr. *Whitegift* came to be Archbishop of *Canterbury*, upon which the business of Nonconformity grew high; for tho' Subscription to the 39 Articles, made by the Convocation 1562, but not confirm'd by Parliament till 1572 (which was the Thirteenth of *Eliz.*) was requir'd, yet it was only by such as were to be admitted to Livings, and that

that only so far as concern'd Matters of Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments. 'Tis true, some Bishops, without any Authority from Parliament, impos'd a Subscription to the Whole, the refusal whereof caus'd Troubles to several particular Men. And herein Mr. *John Fox*, Mr. *Lawrence Humfrey* and Mr. *Anthony Gilby*, and others, appear'd Nonconformists, Mr. *John Fox* pulling out his *Greek Testament*, plainly told the Archbishop, he would subscribe to nothing but *That*. For between the Years 1563 and 1583, some Bishops began to press a Subscription to Two Articles more, viz. To acknowledge the Queen's Supremacy, which no Protestant refus'd; And that the Common-Prayer-Book, the Book of Homilies, and the Book of Ordering Bishops, Priests and Deacons, contain'd in them nothing contrary to the Word of God, which some Bishops of that Age adventur'd to do on their own Authority, having no Legal Establishment, but directly contrary to the Statute of 25 *Hen. VIII.* which restrain'd them from putting any Canons in use, to be made after that time, unless they had first the King's Assent. For tho' the Use of the Common-Prayer was requir'd by an Act 1 *Eliz.* yet this Subscription about the Ordering of Bishops was not, under any Penalty of Suspension or Deprivation.

But after that *Whitgift* came to the Archiepiscopal See, the Persecution of Nonconformists grew high. And that which seem'd to give the External Occasion to the Activity of the Bishops in this Case, was two sorts of Dissenters, viz. *Thorow Nonconformists*, and the *Conforming Nonconformists*.

1. Of the first sort, some dissented as to the Common-Prayer-Book and Ceremonies only, as Mr. *Field*, Mr. *Wilcox*, Mr. *Standon*, Mr. *Boxham*, Mr. *Saintcloe*, Mr. *Clare*, Mr. *Edmonds*. Others that were for a Reformation of Discipline, as Mr. *Clark*, Mr. *Travers*, Mr. *Barber*, Mr. *Gardner*, Mr. *Cheston*,
Mr.

(XXIV)

Mr. Crook, Mr. Egerton; many of which were miserably treated in the High Commission. And that which added to the Flame, was a great noise of a *Presbytery* set up at *Wandsworth* in *Surry*; which was in truth but this, The *Queen's* and *Bishops* Orders extending no further to the Tryal of the Fitness of Communicants at the Lord's Table, than to be able to say the *Lord's Prayer*, the *Creed*, and the *Ten Commandments*, which was justly judg'd a very incompetent Qualification for so Sacred a Mystery, and so far from the Practice of the Primitive Churches, a stricter Examination was agreed upon, by some of the more Conscientious Ministers, to keep up the Honour of this Ordinance; And in order to it, Ten or Eleven Persons were chosen to be present at that Action, and determined, that they would have none admitted to the Table of the Lord, until in the Church he had made Confession of his Faith, and this was but precariously done, by a voluntary Agreement among themselves. The truth is, the Matter of Discipline came into very little Debate before 1584, after that Subscription had been so fatally impos'd, which was an Engine first form'd by Archbishop *Whitgift*, and was one of those 16 Proposals he offer'd to the Queen for the settling of the Church, and which put the Queen upon adding Force to the Imposition; which indeed had been by some Bishops begun before, but now more generally and rigorously pressed. Whereby many Godly, Able, Painful Ministers were outed all over *England*, of which we have an account of 60 and more in *Suffolk*, 21 in *Lincolnshire*, 64 in *Norfolk*, 38 in *Essex*, and proportionable more or less in the other Counties; and that while in that one County of *Essex* there was an account given of 163 Ministers that never preach'd, but only read Prayers and Homilies, and 85 more that were Pluralists, Non-residents, or Persons notoriously debauch'd.

This

This was the First-fruit of that Archbishop's Pre-ferment, and as effectual a Course as he could have devis'd to root out the Reformed Religion as soon as it was planted in these Churches. For this you may read the Author of *The Unlawful Practices of Prelates*; where you will find what the abominable Effects of these Impositions were. *The Case* (says he) *was general; Means were used, Ministers presented Doubts, Protestations, Supplications, for which they were Repuls'd, Revil'd, Threatned; The Ministers did endure, being sustain'd by a good Conscience; but their miserable Flocks were subject to all Disorders, Spoils, and Havocks.* These things Gentlemen of all sorts took to heart, and humbly sued to the Archbishop for redress, but all in vain, tho' several Noblemen and Privy-Connellers made their Addresses to him, of which I might transcribe several Copies, enough to make the Heart of any that hath but the least Sense of true Religion in it to relent. But to all this the Archbishop being deaf, their Humble Supplications were made to the Queen, and to the Lords of the Privy-Council, of which, Copies are extant in the foremention'd Author. This was the general Cry of the whole Kingdom from all parts of it, and which at last obtain'd a little, tho' but a little Mitigation of the Episcopal Tyranny.

2. Besides these, there were the *Semi-conformists*, or the *Conforming Nonconformists*, and who were the greater number, who had subscrib'd to read the *Common-Prayer*, but not to read it fully, and in all the parts of it. Thus many subscrib'd with Exceptions and Limitations, and Protestations that their Subscriptions should not oblige them to do any thing contrary to the Word of God, as in their Consciences they were perswaded. And by this means a Preaching Ministry was preserv'd in *England*, which had the Bishop kept to his first Severity, had been destroy'd throughout the Kingdom, before the
Refor-

(XXVI)

Reformation was 28 years old; or else they must have divided into Separate Congregations, as we have since been necessitated to do.

And yet notwithstanding these their Subscriptions, and Compliances to the utmost that their Consciences would suffer them, very many of these Good Men were suspended, Imprison'd, and wearied out of their Lives in the *High Commission*, for not wearing the *Surplice*, not using the *Cross in Baptism*, not keeping *Holy-days*, not Reading all the *Prayers*, and such-like things. The Bishop was inexorable, and the Queen inflexible, the best of Men discouraged, reviled, persecuted, a Half-Reformation daily growing worse and worse, Petitions, Remonstrances and Lamentations from all parts of the Nation, without any good effect. This was the State of the Church of England from 1583 to 1603, when King James came to the Crown.

And now some hopes were conceiv'd by some, that better Measures would be taken as to Church-Affairs. But as soon as the Prince ascended the English Throne, the Prelatick Party, dreading lest the *Puritans*, as they were then call'd, should have too great a share in his Favours, bent all their Arts to create Prejudices in him against them; wherein Bishop *Bancroft*, among others, was excessively active, as appears by a Letter from one *Norton* a Stationer in *Edinburgh*, directed for him and intercepted; and by the same Bishop's Letter to Mr. *Patrick Adamson*, the Titular Bishop of *St. Andrews*, some of which Letters were also intercepted.

This *Adamson* had compos'd a *Declaration*, which pass'd under the King's Name, in which the whole Order of the Kirk was traduc'd and condemn'd; of this the Commissioners of the General Assembly complain'd to the King; the King disown'd it, and said, it was not his doing, but the Archbishop's, for

Vid. Calderw.
Hist. of the Ch.
of Scotl. p. 284.

(XXVII)

for which that great Favourite was discarded, who afterward Recanted, and ingenuously confess'd, That he was commanded to write that *Declaration* by the *Chancellor*, the *Secretary*, and another great *Courtier*; and that he was more busy with some Bishops in *England*, in prejudice to the Discipline of the Kirk, partly when he was there, and partly by mutual Intelligence, than became a good Christian, much less a faithful Pastor.

And however the King had hearkened to this sort of Men, by whom he had a prospect of advancing his Prerogative, yet when he began to see the ill Effects of their Conduct, he deserted, and declar'd against them, particularly in the *National Assembly*, 1590. "He thank'd God that he was King of such a Country wherein there is such a Church, even the sincerest Church on Earth, Geneva not excepted, seeing they keep some Festivals (says he) as Easter and Christmas, and what have they for it? As for our Neighbours in England, their Service is an ill mumb'd Mass in English, they want little of the Mass but the Liftings. Now I charge you, my good People, Barons, Gentlemen, Ministers and Elders, that you all stand to your Purity, and exhort the People to do the same, and as long as I have Life and Crown I will maintain the same. And at his parting with them to come for England, he gave them his Solemn Promise to the same effect. And tho' that Passage in his ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΡΟΝ be by some objected against us, where he says, "Take heed my Son of such Puritans, very Pests in the Church and Commonwealth; Whom no Deserts can oblige, &c. He Himself declares his own Sense of the word Puritan in the Preface of that Book, where he says that the Name Puritan did properly belong to that Sect among the Anabaptists, call'd, The Family of Love, because they think themselves Pure, and in a manner without Sin. And says further,

(XXVIII)

" I protest upon my Honour, I did not mean it generally
" of all those Preachers, or others, that like better the
" single Form of Policy in our Church, than of the ma-
" ny Ceremonies of the Church of England, or that
" are perswaded their Bishops smell of a Papal Supre-
" macy, No, (says he) I am so far from being con-
" tentious in these things, that I equally love and ho-
" nour the Learned and Grave Men of either Opinion.
And now the King being come into England the
oppressed Nonconformists begin to Petition him ;
Seven Hundred and Fifty Ministers hands at once,
desiring the Reformation of certain Ceremonies and
Abuses in the Church, and Deliverance from their
former Oppressions. Whereupon the
Calder. p. 474. Bishops were call'd upon, and grave-
ly desir'd to advise upon all the Cor-
ruptions of this Church, in Doctrine, Ceremonies
and Discipline, and that they should return with
their Answer the Third day after ; accordingly
they return'd and gave their Answer, *As was well.*
And when his Majesty with great fervency brought
instances to the contrary, they upon their knees
with great earnestness, crav'd, " That nothing
" might be alter'd, lest the *Papish Recusants*, punish-
" ed for Disobedience, and the *Puritans* punished
" by Deprivation, *ab Officio & Beneficio*, for Non-
" conformity, should say, they had just cause to in-
" sult upon them, as Men who had endeavour'd to
" bind them to that which by their own Mouths
" now was confessed to be erroneous. After Five
hours Dispute had by his Majesty against them, and
his resolution for Reformation intimated to them,
they were dismiss'd for that day. Yet notwith-
standing all this, their Flatteries and Importuni-
ties at last prevail'd with him, so that in the very
First year, the Convocation establish'd the Three
Articles by Canon, which Twenty years before had
made such Confusion in the Church, which Canons
were

were confirm'd by King James, tho' never brought to a Parliament, nor confirm'd by them. Here Subscription to the Three Articles was enjoyn'd by *Can. 36. Bowing at the Name of Jesus by Can. 18.* and a multitude of other things by other *Canons*. Upon this there was a Petition presented to his Majesty by more than a Thousand Ministers from all parts of the Nation, the Sum of which was to be eas'd and deliver'd from the Burden of Humane Rites and Ceremonies, and the Tyrannical effects of them, which you may read at large in *Dr. Fuller's Church-History.* *Hop Lib. 10. p. 22.*

"his Majesty resented this Petition is
 "variously reported, (says Fuller) but sure it is, it
 "ran the Gantlop thro' all the Prelatical Party, every
 "one giving it a lash with their Pens, more with their
 "Tongues, and the Dumb Ministers, as they term it,
 "found their Speech most vocal against it. Several of
 the Petitioners were Suspended, Deprived, Imprisoned. And a great Division arose, which held during *Archbishop Bancroft's* time, who succeeded *Whitgift*, but his Successor Bishop *Abbot* was much calmer. These were the Steps that the English Clergy made with that Scotch Prince, whose virtues were too sensibly signalliz'd to be yet forgotten.

After James succeeded Charles the First in the Throne, and after *Abbot* succeeded *Laud* in the Archiepiscopal See, who made a new Addition of Impositions, as *Saying Second Service at the Table*; *Setting that at the East end of the Church Altarwise*, *Commanding the Communion-Table to be rais'd in*, and *all the People to come up thither and to receive the Communion Kneeling*; *Bowing at the name of Jesus*, *forbidding Lectures and Afternoon Sermons*, *Pressing the Book of Sports on the Lord's-Day*, and many other things of this kind. What the lamentable Effects of these things were, and what Disturbances Bishop *Wren* made in *Suffolk*, and others in other Diocesses,

What

What numbers of the best Preachers were again Suspended and Depriv'd, is yet fresh in the Memories of many now alive; and what work the Convocation Oath of *Et Cætera*, in 1640. made, and would further have made, had not a Parliament spoil'd that Design. Such hath all along been the Decent and Orderly fruits of your Ceremonies and Impositions in these Kingdoms. But how little your Interest gain'd by it, appear'd to all the World in 1641, when the Parliament began to break the Bonds of these Oppressors. For they saw, they had not only lost their best Preachers, but many of their best Subjects were remov'd into other Countries; the Trade and Strength of the Nation decay'd, and carried abroad, which was a Publick and irreparable Loss: The People in many Places become Ignorant and Brutish, for want of better Preaching, and Popery returning like a Flood upon them; *Popish Doctrines* published, and *Colledges* fixed for *Romish Priests* and *Nuns*: Wherefore they thought it now high time to put an end to these Practices, which had caus'd all these Disorders, and to rescue the King out of the hands of those Counsellors, that had so fatally misled him. Hereupon the King, instigated by *Popish* and *Prelatical* Counsels, took up Arms against his Parliament, in hope to settle himself in an Arbitrary Power; but Heaven was pleas'd to break these Measures, and to take them in their own Snares.

It belongs not to me, but to another Profession of Men, to determine the Justice or Injustice of these Wars, but rather to lament the Mismanagement of the *Victory*, which is to be attributed especially to the same sort of Instruments, who first set the King against his Parliament, in hope to have succeeded that way. And for the Vindication of the *Presbyterians* in this matter against those *Calumnies* wherewith they have been charg'd, I shall
refer

referr you to *Rushworth's Collections*, the Supplement to *Baker's Chronicle*, and to the *Rolls and Journals* of that Parliament, and the *Vindication of the Ministers*, printed 1648, by *T. Underhil*, and Subscrib'd by Fifty Eight of the most Eminent Ministers of that time, which is too large here to transcribe.

But now on the Restauration of King *Charles the Second*, in 1660, every one was ready to promise himself a *Deliverance* from the Evils, under which the whole Nation had so long been groaning, both from his Majesties Declaration at *Scoon*, at his first Coronation in *Scotland*, and at *Bredab*, and in *England* too, on his first Arrival here, which I might transcribe at large, but these things being so well known to all that have made Observation of the Times, I shall spare that Labour. But instead of what was pretended and promised, we had the Yoke made yet much heavier, not only all the Old Subscriptions requir'd, but several New Devices of *Reordination*, and *Abjuration*, to the Ejecting of more than Two Thousand Ministers at once of such as were call'd *Presbyterians*, besides the vast number of all other sorts of Dissenters, and exposing them to all the Penal Laws that had been formerly made against any Dissenters *Protestant* or *Popish*, with an Addition of New ones. This was such a Blow as made all the Nations around us to stare, and *Rome* to clap her hands, and laugh at us. Now, they thought the *Sampson* was bound, with whom the *Philistines* design'd to make themselves Sport, and bound indeed with *New Cords*, which had never been before occupied: For the Old Non-conformists, tho' depriv'd of their Benefices, yet were not forbidden to Preach, where-ever they could find opportunity, and few would deny them their Pulpits, especially if they were not too popular: And this took off the Occasion of setting up Separate Con-

gregations in those days; but now we must be driven out of the Church, so as none of our Fathers were dealt with: And therefore were under a necessity either Sacrilegiously to desert our Ministry, and leave the People who were dissatisfy'd with these Impositions, either to act with doubting Consciences in Complying, or to perish under those wretched Guides, that were in many Places set over them, or else to run headlong after the *Baptists* and *Quakers*, as very many were too forward to do; or, to keep them in some measure of Consistency, we must exercise our own Ministerical Office among them in Separate Congregations: Which for these Reasons we did, and thought it our bounden Duty so to do, tho' we ran the hazard of so many Penal Laws as were made against us, and so severely executed on us; and when you your self, Sir, (if the Testimony of your Neighbours be true) could in the heat of your Zeal, animate some of the most violent Executioners of this wrath against us, and encourage them to the Spoil, by telling them, *That God would bless 'em the better*; yet these things we patiently endur'd, without Mutinies, or any appearance of Rebellion.

And when it pleas'd the King to pluck us out of the jaws of those that were worrying us, by suspending the Penal-Laws against us, this anger'd many of you, not so much that it was done by an Unlimited *Dispensing Power*, which was then so dangerously and illegally challenged, (for that was agreeable enough to the Doctrine of *Absolute Sovereignty*, *Passive Obedience*, and *Non-resistance*, which your Pulpits almost every where sounded of) but because it gave some check to the rage of the Persecuting Spirit. But that a little Respite in the midst of these burning Fits of Persecution should be very acceptable to the Persecuted, I hope you will not find in your heart to wonder at, by what hand
 soever

soever the Relief comes, and whatever the more remote Designs of it were, wherein they were not at all concern'd as Contrivers or Abettors; Shelter is good in a Storm, tho' but under a Bramble. For this, Publick Thanks were given, not only to God, to whom indeed it was due, but to Man too, who was the more immediate Instrument of it, by several, who Subscrib'd such *Addresses*. But for my own part, tho' Ease and Liberty was good, and never sweeter than at such a time, and which, simply consider'd, was a just occasion of returning Thanks to God; yet as for any *Addresses* of this kind to Man, the other End of whose Design in it was so visible and palpable; I never set any Hand of mine to, but declar'd against it, as far as I was concern'd so to do. But indeed when we had our Liberty in a Parliamentary way, I thought it better deserv'd thanks, and the rather, for that it was so hardly obtain'd from such as were our Enemies.

To conclude, When the Bishops and their Party began to see Themselves, with the whole Protestant Interest, both at Home and Abroad, on the brink of Ruin, and that they were like to be undone by Him, whom they had so lately set upon the Throne, how earnestly did they sollicite the Most Illustrious and Warlike Prince of Orange, to arise for Their and Our Deliverance? And in their Petition declar'd, *They would not be wanting in due tenderness to Dissenters*. And at his landing here, all the Discourse was of *Union and Comprehension*; insomuch that a Reverend Prelate told a Dissenting Minister, "He need never to fear Persecutions from the Church of England again, adding, *If any such thing should ever happen, let me be accounted a false Prophet*. Accordingly, when the Prince was come in, and the Fears over, and the Crown set on his Head, an *Act* was pass'd by the King and Parliament for the *Toleration of Dissenters*, and the Se-

(XXXIV)

curing them in their Rights, and Properties, and Liberty of Conscience, and the Suspension of all *Penal Laws* against them, which we have, thro' the Goodness of God, and the Favour of the Government, thus far enjoy'd; and for which you, and some others of your Spirit, are still declaiming against us as *Schismatics*.

This is the short and true Account of the Case, which I could not well put in fewer Words, but might easily have enlarg'd; and from which I conclude,

1. That it is an Argument of a great Stupidity, or Bigottry, not to see from what Fountain all the Troubles, Persecutions and Schisms, that have for these Hundred years and more so harrassed the Churches in these Kingdoms, have issued, and at whose Doors the guilt must be laid,

2. That Non-conformity is no such Unreasonable, nor Contemptible Thing, as you would represent it to be; in which the most Pious, and most Useful and Learned Part of the Nation have from the beginning been engag'd.

3. That the Old *Puritans* were another sort of People than you, and some others have maliciously represented them to be; that is, such as have been opprobriously so called.

4. How improper and ineffectual a Course *Persecution* is to reclaim Men from the real Sentiments of their own Consciences; or to convert them to the *Party* that Persecutes them; and how little reason you have to plead for it, or to vindicate it, pray read Mr. *Lock's* Three Letters of *Toleration*.

5. What a piece of Non-sense it is to blame us for using the *Liberty* which is the fruit of so much Prayer and Patience, when it is graciously allowed us.

6. Whether your damning us for *Schismatics* on this account, be not a Reflection on the Wisdom and

and Integrity of the Government that hath granted this Liberty to us?

But it is now time to return to your *Preface*.

VIII. You charge me with giving you an intimation, that since so much favour hath been shewn us by the Government, our minds are *p. 12.* more alienated from you than ever; which, you say, is a very perverse use of the Act of Indulgence, for that was made to unite the Protestant Subjects in affection, and for which you refer to my *p. 31, 32.* which if any Indifferent Reader will be at the pains to peruse, he will find how perverse a Use you have made of my Words. *The alienating of our minds from you, was Disc. p. 88.* your own Complaint, and which you there propos'd to our Enquiry, because of our setting up Opposite Churches and Officers, and joyning with them. To this we reply'd, That the Separate Churches we now commonly frequent, are not set up in Opposition to yours, but by a necessity which your Obstinate uncharitableness hath brought us under. Could we have enjoy'd those Gospel-Priviledges, which our Dearest Saviour hath by his precious Blood purchas'd for us, and by his Last Will and Testament bequeath'd to us, we had never forsaken you; but now, if the more we come to understand the wrong you have done us, the more our minds are alienated from you, you must thank your selves for that. Who but you would by this have pretended to understand an alienation in Affection, which is the Duty we owe and own to all Men in General, but particularly to all Christians, and much more to Protestants, which is only an alienation in those Acts of Church-Communion with you, on the Terms on which 'tis offer'd us, and which is the matter in Controversy betwixt us? But if there be an alienation in Affection, contrary to

(XXXVI)

to the Design of the *Act of Indulgence*, 'tis wholly on your own side.

IX. Another thing that is very remarkable in your *Preface* is, the wonderful *Confidence* you have, that *We are out of the Way*. You say, *you know it, and you know that we are in danger*. Great, no doubt is your Knowledge, tho' it will hardly amount to Demonstration, no not to Probability to any but those of your own Party and Perswasion: And should I tell you, that I know you are herein mistaken, the Argument will be all as good on our side. *You know* (you say) *that we are out of the Way*, that is, out of your Way; and this we know as well as you. *You know that we are in danger*, that is, of your Displeasure, and the Effects of it, as far as you can reach us, and this also we have known to our sorrow, well nigh these Forty years. But you would now rescue us from the Danger, that is, you would Proselyte us to your Party, and perswade us to prostitute our Consciences to your *Impositions*, and if not, tho' you can't for the present persecute us here, you will *cut us off from Christ*, and damn us to Eternity, and this (you say) is the Charity you have for us. But here I must do you the right to acknowledge, that in the same Paragraph where you say, *you know that you tell us the Truth*, you explain your self with an, or what you take to be so; so that by your own Confession, your *Knowing* is but your *Taking*, as indeed I always take it to be.

Lastly, Your *Conclusion* is a piece of very good practical Advice which you borrowed from Mr. *Baxter*, whom I see you can sometimes set on our side, and under the same Condemnation with us; and sometimes on your own side, when you can pick up any thing from him to throw at our Heads, tho' never so unjustly, or contrary to his plain meaning.

(XXXVII)

meaning. However the good Counsel that is there given in the General, we accept, and heartily embrace, and hope that you have not been at the pains to transcribe it for our sakes only, but for your own too.

Sir, Having thus far attended you in your *Preface*, which gives us the first *Specimen* of the Ingenuity of your Following *Discourse*, and finding the rest to be *ejusdem farinae*, of the same Complexion, I shall not concern my self to wipe off every little Spot of Dirt, which with such an haughty scorn and impotent Spite, you cast at me, lest I should seem too much like you, or to set up for the *Art of Scolding*; but shall diligently attend your Arguments, and examine the strength of 'em, leaving the other *Stuff* to such as have a mind to practice at *Billingsgate* to entertain by-standers.

You complain, that I did not in my *Letter* quote your Pages, which I thought not so very necessary, while I follow'd you as your shadow, by Sections and Paragraphs throughout your Book, and did not start here and there, forward and backward with you, as you have pleas'd to do with me. Wherefore this great Fault shall now be very carefully corrected. And so much for your *Preface*.

THE

HVVX

The Author being at a great Distance from the Press had not the Opportunity of Correcting the Errata of it, amongst others the Reader is desired to Correct with his Pen these, and to excuse the lighter

Preface, Page XII. line 2. for *them* read *you*. p. 5. line 26. for *Sedes* read *Sodes*. p. 8. l. 21. r. *Effected*. p. 11. l. 11. r. *left in the Dark*. p. 14. l. 21. add to acquiesce in. p. 21. l. 26. r. *Hands*. p. 25. l. 13. r. *much*. p. 26. l. 28. r. *thinking*. p. 27. l. 34. r. *Word*. p. 38. l. ult. r. *tenuente*. p. 41. l. 2. r. *Culpable*. p. 42. l. 37. r. *on*. p. 44. l. 18. r. *Kingdom*. p. 59. l. penult. r. *Eximious*. p. 80. l. 4. r. *repeat*. p. 83. l. 12. r. *Solos*. ibid. l. 36. r. *manuum*. p. 84. l. 13. for *ipsam* r. *ipsam Ordinem*. p. 90. l. 34. r. *Exegetical*. p. 97. l. 20. r. *Virum*. p. idem l. 17. r. *Vacaret*. p. 98. l. 18. r. *Presidence*. p. idem l. 35. r. *cum Spectis*. p. idem l. ult. for 789 r. 631. p. 100. l. 4. r. *are*. p. 112. l. 25. dele *of the Dignified ones*. p. 114. l. 4. dele *of*. p. 132. l. 36. r. *Novatus*. p. 146. l. 7, & 8. for *of the greater part* r. *of a great part*.

T H E

Introduction.

I Am now come with you to the *Introduction* of your *Vindication*, where you make a heavy Complaint of the *Wrongs I have done both to the Truth, and to you for defending it*; which, you say, *may sometimes draw from you a just Reproof, but you shall not return to me* page 14. *evil for evil.* What wrong I have done to the *Truth*, is the matter yet in Dispute between us; and to call it *Truth*, before you have prov'd it to be so, is to beg the Question. And how much I have wronged you in that *Letter*, let those that are impartial compare our *Notes*, and then judge. But if I was therein sharper than you expected, and than the tenderness of your *Bile* could well bear, I hope you have now requited me Seven fold, tho' you pretend *not to return evil for evil.* I find little else in your *Introduction*, but the Indelicacies of a bitter Passion, that drew from you nothing that conduces to the Interest of the Questions before us, but the blowing your Trumpet before your *Charitable Contribution to Foreign Protestants*, wherein most of the Church of *England-Men* have signalliz'd the partiality of their Charity: And your liberal Promise of enlarging towards me at the same rate, which Promise you have been very true to in your following Pages; and the Method you
 B propose

propose to proceed in, in this your *Vindication*, which is Regular enough, and the only part of your *Introduction* that was worth so much Ink and Paper.

Viz.

- p. 16. 1. To confirm what you have said of Church-Union.
2. To set down some Articles wherein we are agreed concerning Schism.
3. To examine the things that are chiefly in debate between us on the same Subject.
4. To review the things that have been said in defence of the Separation, and confirm your Answers to them.
5. To enquire into other things, which (you say) I have brought into the Controversy, or which may incidently require consideration. And then proceed to the Conclusion.

So that now we have our Work before us, and which I shall readily attend you in, and in as clean a way as I can walk thro' the Mire and Dirt of your following Lines.

Sect. I. Of the Unity of the Church.

Here at the first entrance you salute me with your ordinary rude Compliment of *Inconsistence* and *Self-contradiction*; because, you having granted that the Union of the Church does consist in these Three things, *Viz. Faith, Love, and outward Worship, and Communion*, I had reply'd, That by your arguing on it, you made as if a few variable, unscriptural, and confessedly indifferent Ceremonies were the only true Cement and badge of Christian Union; which I think I had reason to say,

- Disc. p. 9.* 1. Because you seem'd to make so light of the Two first of these, and said you would but touch on them, but more largely insist on the last, in which the Controversy between us is chiefly concerned. 2. Because you told us, that the meer inward

Love

Love of Christians was not capable of being a publick badge of their Profession, but that without Communion in External Rites and Ordinances, 'tis impossible, as a visible Society, to appear in the eye of the world, as one, notwithstanding their agreement in Faith and Affection, and which was the Sum of your Discourse from p. 115. to p. 130. Indeed what your Metaphysical Notion of a meer inward Love will signify, is uncertain, but most certain it is that a Sincere inward Love will naturally discover it self to the observation of others, in all the Lawful and necessary outward acts of Union and Communion: So that it was not I that did represent Faith and Love, or the Publick Worship of God, or any thing else that is of Divine Institution, as unscriptural or confessedly indifferent Ceremonies, as you so very unsequentially suggest; but 'twas you that had given the preference of your own unscriptural Ceremonies, which you confess to be Indifferent, to those Divine Graces of Faith and Love, and without which (you say) the true Christian Faith and Love cannot constitute a person a Member of the Church of Christ. And yet you have granted over and over, that the Faith of God's Elect is one, and invariably the same for ever, but those Rituals of the Church, which you make the indispensable condition of Communion with it, are variable, and varied according to Times and Places. Let any unprejudic'd judge determine then on whose side the Inconsistence, and Self-contradiction lies.

From what I granted you concerning p. 8.
 the Oneness of the Catholick Church,
 and of Communicating with any Particular Church
 in all Externals and Circumstantials, as far as may
 be done without Sin, (in which case only you say
 you argue for it) you conclude, *That one would think
 that I had given up the Cause to you, and put an end to
 the Dispute: And why would not one as reasonably*
 B 2 think,

think, that you had given up the Cause to me, by granting all that I demanded? But it seems *this is not to be expected* (to return you your own words) *from one that is perpetually at war with himself*, and to which I add, from one that hath no better way of arguing, than by begging the Question: For you take it for granted, that this Communion may be had by us without Sin, which is still the Controversy between us. Besides, had it been for your turn, you might have observ'd that what I there granted was only a Right of Communicating in any Church of Christians, whither he should come, not that it was any ones duty actually to joyn in External Communion, where the Terms are sinful or doubtful. What I there further wrote on this Head, I shall not here repeat, nor am I yet asham'd to own; but refer the Reader to it.

p. 18.

You censure me for *imagining that you hold it necessary that all Churches should have the same Ceremonies*; and all the Inferences that I drew from it, you call a *fighting with my own shadow*, and that *you are not concerned in the success of the Combat*. What the Opinion is which you hold, as a Secret to your self, I cannot divine; but pray consider, Was it not the Unity of the Church that you were there insisting on, and that not of this or that *Particular*, but of the *Catholick Church*, *however it be dispersed in the World*, and that *this Catholick is one Political Body*. For

Disc. p. 29.

it is the Universal Church, that is said in Scripture to be one Body. With this one Catholick Political Church, you tell us we must, on pain of being cut off from Christ, hold Communion, not only in Faith, and in Baptism, and the Worship of the One true God, and in all those things that are of the Essence of it as Christian, and which are one and the same all the Christian World over; but that we are equally oblig'd to hold

hold Communion with this Church in all its Rituals and External Modes of Worship, and whatsoever is made and appointed by Men as the Condition of this Outward Communion with it. And if so,

1. Do you not then make these *Matters and Conditions of Outward Communion* as Essential to the Church, as its *Faith* or any thing else?

2. Is there any of the required Outward Communion to be held with this Church, without a strict observance of all its Ceremonies?

3. Is it not necessary then that all these required *Conditions of Outward Communion* with it, be its *Catholick*, and as much *One*, as its *Faith*, or *Baptism*, or any thing else?

If it must be *One*, is it possible to deviate from it, or to vary its Forms and Terms of Outward Communion with it, without a Schismatical Dividing and Rending it in pieces? Must not all Particular Churches then, which are but the Constituting, or Integrating parts of the Whole Catholick Church, have the very same Rites, and Ceremonies, and Conditions of Outward Communion? Or else have you gotten the Art of dividing *One* into an Hundred or more, and yet continue it perfectly *One* still, even in that respect wherein it is divided? *Dic sedes & eris mihi magnus Apollo.* Or else, will you make your Catholick Church an *Ens Rationis*, or a *Materia Prima*, capable of all Forms to be introduc'd by the Wit and Will of Man? For by the Catholick Church I hope you do not mean that which some others in the World do.

4. Besides, Was there not a time when the Catholick Christian Church was but *One Individual Church*, yea a Congregation at *Jerusalem*? If Rites and Ceremonies were as necessary to Communion with that Church as the Doctrine of Faith, Baptism, Repentance, or any other thing, would it not have

been as necessary that all its Rites and Terms of Outward Communion should be ascertain'd, and enter'd into the *Canon*, that all the Particular Churches that should ever spring from her, might know how, and wherein to hold Communion with her, and not be damn'd for Schismatics? For how is it possible for any Particular Church to separate from her in the matters of Outward Communion, and yet be therein One with her? Now, Sir, with whose *Shadow* it is that I have been fighting, let others judge, and how far you are concern'd in the issue of the *Combate*.

p. 19. But whatever your *Premises* were, you now hope to set all right by denying the *Conclusion*; and tell us that you never held it necessary that all Churches should have all the same *External Rites*; or that any One of them should be the *Oracle*, or give *Laws* to all the rest. And you tell us too, that this is the *Sense and Practice* of the Church of England, as it was of the *Ancients* in things of this nature. And that the

p. 21. Churches of distant Countries may differ in their *Ceremonies*, and yet maintain the *Catholick Unity*. But methinks the Consistency of *This*, and of your Notion of *Catholick Unity* is not so very clear. For you have not yet told us, on what Reason, or by what Law, or Right, any of those Churches that first issued, and were numerically divided from that Original *Catholick Church and Congregation*, did vary, as to their Rites, and Terms of Outward Communion, from that out of which they sprang, or how it could be done without what you call *Schism*. Were they not, by your *Hypothesis*, bound, while they continued in that Church, to observe all the Rites and Ceremonies of it? How then came they at this Liberty of taking, or leaving, or altering or adding of these things, when separated from it?

it? Yea, were not all the Descendent Particular Christian Churches in the World, in the same relation to that first Catholick Church, as the Members of any Particular Church are to it? And should not the Catholick Union be as entirely preserv'd, by your Principles, in Rites and Ceremonies, as in Faith, &c. Unless you can produce the License from that *Mother Church*, Authorizing them so to do; or unless you will grant they did it by vertue of a *Natural Right*, and *Power* in themselves so to do, immediately on their being thus separated from it. And if so, then 'tis but for a Church to separate from another, to which they once belonged, and they are at Liberty, as to Rites and Ceremonies, and yet safe as to Catholick Unity: And this, perhaps, is the bottom and truth of the case. All particular Churches, being of equal Power and Authority *inter se*, have a Natural Right to order all matters that are but of Humane Institution, and allowable by the general Rules of the Scriptures, according to occurring Circumstances of Times and Places, for their own particular Edification, and to alter and change them as the Case of the Church shall require. And then I hope you will give me leave hence to infer, That all other, especially Reformed Churches of Christ in the World, whether *Lutheran* or *Calvinist*, have an equal Right and Interest in this Liberty, as the Church of *England*: And then *Geneva* and *Scotland*, and the poor envied Churches of the *Presbyterians* (to descend no lower) in *England* and *Ireland*, are justify'd in their Ecclesiastical Constitutions, as out of the danger of being cut off as Schismatics from the Union of the Catholick Church, notwithstanding they are not of the Church of *England's* Communion in Rites and Ceremonies, unless you will adventure to say, that our not having Bishops, that is, Diocesan Bishops, over us, is that which will

B 4

inevitably

inevitably destroy us; and if so, then farewell to all the *Reformed Churches*, besides yours, and the *Lutheran*. But could we have obtain'd but one good Bishop to have cast off all these controverted matters, and so to have been our Head, we had been safe, unless you would throw the Bishop into Hell with us for a Schismatick too. And if this be not, pray tell us what is, the sense of your Arguings.

Will you be so kind, as to grant, what I think you cannot well deny, That such a Liberty as this may be allow'd, Provided that this Separation, or Division of a Church into more Particular Independent, or Co-ordinate Churches, be made by the *Authority* and *Establishment* (for perhaps meer *Toleration* will not do) of that Church out of which the Division is made, as in the Propagation of the Church in Foreign Dominions, and under distinct Civil Governments; or by a Necessity, as in cases of Persecution? Then I will ask you, (1.) What Provision you will allow in such Cases of necessary Reformation, as cannot be affected without Separation, which, you know, was the case of Protestant Reformers? Were they Schismaticks because they separated without the consent, or Authority of that Church they separated from? If so, you will do well to reconcile us again to our *Old Mother*; but that which justify'd that Reformation, will justify another. (2.) If this Liberty must depend upon, and be determin'd by the *bene placitum*, and Extent of the Empire of the Civil Government, then, either these Rites and Ceremonies, about which the Liberty is concern'd, are no Sacred things, or else it is a profaning of that which is Sacred, and a justifying the *Whore of Babylon*, in extending the Cup of her Fornications according to the bounds of the Empire on which she sits. (3.) If the case of Persecution will do it, as it did at *Jerusalem*, then have the

the Nonconformists of this and of the past Age enough to say on that Head too, for their justification.

The next thing you prescribe to us, p. 23. is a *Catholick Antidote, or Preservative* of the Unity of the whole Body, which is a *Composition* of these Two *Simples*. The First is, That every Christian actually Communicate with that sound Part of the Catholick Church, which he finds where he resides, or Divine Providence casts his Lot. The Second is, That Private Christians obey the Spiritual Guides, that are therein lawfully establish'd.

The following part of this your First Section you bestow not in the *Explication*, which one would think were very necessary, but in the *Confirmation* of it, right or wrong, which indeed is a very quick, but not so safe a way of Preparing a *Medicine* of so great a Title.

1. On the First, I find very little you have to say, only you pretend to prove it, and that *Clearly*: For you say, To clear this, it is to be observ'd, That there is a nearer Alliance amongst the Faithful remaining in the same place, than can be exercis'd amongst those that are of distant Countries. So then your Argument runs thus.

There is a nearer Alliance amongst the Faithful remaining in the same place, than can be exercis'd amongst those of distant Countries. Ergo, It is the duty of every Christian actually to Communicate with that sound part of the Catholick Church, which he finds where he resides, or where Divine Providence casts his Lot. *Baculus stat in angulo, ergo, pluit.* What Alliance there is between your Argument and your Conclusion, I must confess my self too dull to comprehend. You say, we ought to Communicate with any sound part of the Catholick Church where ever we are, and where ever we come, at home or abroad, because we have nearer Alliances at home, than abroad. Is not this

Quid-

Quidlibet ex quolibet? One would think you had now a mind to *Lampoon* upon your self. But perhaps by your *Clearing* of this your Position, you did not mean to *Prove* it, but to *Clear* your hands of it, which, in my judgment, you had done more cleverly, if you had said never a Word to it. But to let your Argument alone, wherein I am as little concern'd, as that which you pretend to *Clear* by it.

However, This First *Ingredient* of your *Preservative*, must be better examin'd and duly corrected before it can safely enter into this your *Composition Ex duobus*. You say, That to preserve the *Unity* of the whole Body, it is requisite that every Christian actually Communicate with that sound part of the Catholick Church, which he finds where he resides, or where Divine Providence casts his Lot. Now

1. By Communicating, in this Proposition, you must give me leave to conjecture, that you mean Communicating, not only in Faith and Love, &c. but in all External Rites and Ceremonies, of what number or kind soever they be, so that they do not destroy the *Truth* of the Church; I say, the *Truth*, unless, by your *sound part*, you mean the *Purer part*, which I suppose is too *Puritannical* to be your meaning: And,

2. How far you will allow the Church of Rome, or any of the *Armenian*, *Greek*, or *Lutheran* Churches to be sound parts of the Catholick, I cannot tell; you had dealt more openly with us, if you had describ'd, or told us more plainly what Churches, or whether any besides your own, you take to be *Sound Parts*; or what degree of *Soundness* it is that will serve your turn; or by whom the *Soundness* of it is to be judg'd; or whether every Christian be bound to take the Churches own word for its *Soundness*, without asking any Question about it, tho' for Conscience sake, which last would sound very harshly in every Ear that hath any serious concern for his
own

own Soul, and is inconsistent with the Liberty of a Private Judgment, if not in the Notion, yet in the Practice of it, and which is acknowledg'd by the most Learned and Orthodox of your own Church to be the Natural, Fundamental, and Sacred Right of every Man, consider'd as a Rational and Religious Creature.

3. You say, *'Tis every Christian's Duty thus actually to Communicate.* Now who they are that you will please to own for Christians, is another thing that you have here laid in the dark; Whether all those that have receiv'd Christian Baptism; or whether you will own that to be Christian Baptism, which is not done in the Way of the Church of *England*, this there is reason to question, because that which you call Christian Burial, is, by so many of you, denied to such; or whether every Christian must be taken in the largest extent of its signification, as your unlimited Expression doth undeniably import: If so, you were best to consider, how it agrees with the Doctrine and Discipline of your *Church of England*, which in the Rubrick of the Communion, hath bar'd that Ordinance against several kinds of Immoralities, as the Common Light of Reason, and the Nature of that Ordinance, have done against all such as are under natural, or preternatural incapacities; so that perhaps the greater part of Baptized Christians will be necessarily bar'd against what you say every Christian must actually do, to preserve the Unity of the Catholick Church; But,

4. If it be every Christians Duty actually to Communicate with that Sound part of the Catholick Church, which he finds at home or abroad; then ought you to make no Scruple of Communicating with the *Presbyterian* Churches, unless you will disown them, as no Sound, i. e. no true parts of the Catholick Church. So that your *Preservative*

is like to prove a very inartificial and deleterious sort of *Medicine*, if made up after your loose and general Prescription, as to this First Ingredient of it.

p. 24.

2. The other part of your *Preservative* is this, *It is the Duty of Private Christians to obey the Spiritual Guides which are Lawfully Establish'd in any Sound part of the Catholick Church where they reside.* And this, I perceive, is that wherein the main force and vertue of the *Medicament* lies; the plain Sense whereof is this: That we ought to be govern'd and determin'd, in all matters that concern our Souls, by those Ecclesiastical Officers that are by *Law Establish'd*, and set over us; where the word *Establish'd* seems to carry all the *Emphasis*, and is of great use in opposition to *Tolerated*, lest any, that stand under that Character, should pretend to a share with you in this your Catholick Rule. And on this it is that you spend the remaining part of your First Section. But before I can close with you, it will be necessary to distinguish on what you have too generally prescrib'd to us, as a Rule of our Practice. For,

1. You say, *'Tis the Duty of Private Christians*; where I hope you do not exempt your self, nor the rest of your Brethren from Obedience to your Ecclesiastical Superiours, tho' you stand in a *Publick Post*; but to let that pass,

2. You say, *'Tis their Duty to obey their Spiritual Guides.* This looks indeed as if your Rule were calculated only for the Laity, because the Spiritual Guides comprehend the whole Clergy, both Superiour and Inferiour, by what Names or Titles soever Dignify'd or Distinguished, and unto whom you claim the Obedience you are pleading for. I commend you that you are aware not to assert the painful Duty of Obedience, but in favour to your self. But when you lay this Duty of Obedience to the
Spiritual

Spiritual Guides on all Private Christians, I would hope you do not expect they should pay you a *blind Obedience*, but that you will please to give them leave to be first satisfy'd in their own Consciences, of the Lawfulness of your Commands, lest they should chance to disobey God in obeying you; unless you can assure them that you are *Infallible* in what you require their Obedience to, which I doubt will be a hard matter for you to do, with those that have been but competently instructed in the Divine Rules of the Gospel, and that have any serious regard for their own Souls. For your calling them *Spiritual Guides* can signify but this, That they are such as are Ministerially entrusted in the Spiritual Affairs of Men's Souls; but the Carnality and Immorality of the Principles and Conversations of too many of them is notoriously evident to the World; which I now write, Sir, without any Reflection on your self, or on any others, who have, by a stricter degree of Morality, obtain'd a fairer Character in the Church of *England*. Neither will this justify that latitude of the Obedience you require, that you are *Guides Lawfully established in a Sound part of the Catholick Church*. For to be *Lawfully Established* can signify but this, To be establish'd by Law. And this gives us the occasion to consider, by what and whose Law it is that they are to be establish'd; which can be no other than either the Law of God, or the Law of Man, or of both. If you mean the Law of God, we shall soon so far agree, if we can but once be brought to a right Understanding of what the Law of God is in this case; tho' yet this will not be enough to vindicate the Duty or the Lawfulness of our Obedience to all its Commands and Conditions of Outward Communion with it. For tho' a Church be of Divine Establishment, as to its Constitution, Doctrine, and the Essentials of a True Church, yet it may grievously sin in many things

things of Human Invention, which it may require in order to Outward Communion with it. But if you mean Establish'd by the Law of Man, then is your Doctrin calculated for any Meridian in the World, where any stated Publick Worship of a Deity, true or false, is by Law Established. Neither will this relieve you, to say, it must be a *Sound part of the Catholick Church*, while the Word *Catholick*, of which you are so fond, gives so uncertain a sound, and while it is certain that every one is Sound and Orthodox to himself. But will you say that 'tis the Word of God that must determine what is Sound, and what is Unsound in all Church-matters? Say and hold, and I will say so too, but then the next knot to be untied will be this, Who shall interpret for us the true Sense of this Word of God? For we see how familiarly some Men can make it a Nose of Wax, and how fain every one would make it to speak his own Sentiments. Where shall we find that *Infallible Interpreter*, that every one is bound acquiesce in? 'Tis true, the Church is called the *Pillar and Ground of the Truth*, 1 Tim. 3, 15. *στύλη καὶ ῥηνάριον*. not that the Truth is Establish'd on the Authority of the Church, as that of Rome falsely pretends, but it is that Seat, and Place in the Earth, in which the Truth is to be found; the *Pillar* to which it is affixt, and by which it ought to be defended and supported: But for all this we are but little the nearer, till it be better agreed What and Whom we are to understand by the *Church*, which is made so ambiguous a Name. 'Tis true, there is that which is called the *Analogy of Faith*; which is a sure, unerring and determining Rule in all the Essentials of the Christian Religion: And there is the *Analogy of Right Reason* too, as a Subordinate Rule to guide us therein: But where is that *Church*, or who is that *Interpreter*, that shall determine to us all matters of Rites and Ceremonies;

mies, and what shall or shall not be imposed, of things confessedly Indifferent, and therefore not necessary? Here you will say, That every particular Church hath this Power in it self, to determine for it self, and for its Members. But then

1. I hope it will be granted, that no Church hath this Power over such as are not Members of it.

2. I would ask, Whether any Church under Heaven hath any Power from Christ, to make Members against their Will, or to inflict any other Punishment on such as refuse to be made Members of it, than to deny them the peculiar Priviledges of Church-Members?

3. I am bold to ask you too, What Warrant any Church hath from Christ, to exercise Arbitrary Authority over its Members; and whether the Nature and Tendency of such Authority be not Tyranny and Superstition? For what may not an Arbitrary Power impose?

4. Whether the unbounded Power of Imposing whatsoever is called Indifferent, because in its own Nature it is so, and not expressly forbidden by the Word of God, be not an Arbitrary Power? For what greater Latitude can any Church in the World pretend to practice upon?

5. Whether you have not asserted this unbounded Arbitrary Power, in your denying, that those words of the Apostle 1 *Theff.* 5. 12. *is xupla, in the Lord*, do import the Bounds of our Obedience, as well as the general Matter of it, or

Motive to it, as in my Letter I had Page 25, 26. affirmed? But this you call a very

strange way of interpreting the Laws of God, and an Evasion for our own Convenience; a Perverting of the Holy Scriptures; a making such an Exception from it, as he hath no where allowed; a restraining of the Apostles words, otherwise than he hath done; and a fixing on them what Sense I please. But that we ought to obey

obey them that have the Rule over us without any such Restriction, or Limitation; whether in the Lord, *i. e.* according to the Lord, or not; whether it be according to the Lord's Will, or no; if it be their Wills, it seems it ought to oblige us to Obedience. Sir, Is not this Arrogant and Arbitrary enough? What can you say more, unless you will express it in their words, *Psal. 2. 3. Let us break their Bonds asunder, and cast away their Cords from us?* No, but you will tell us, *They are only things confessedly Indifferent that we are required to obey them in.* This is your *Evasion*, and a sorry one, because a palpable *Fallacy*; for when you say, *Confessedly Indifferent*, you would have the World believe, that we confess these things to be *Indifferent, i. e. Indifferent in their Religious Use*, which is what we utterly deny; but 'tis you only that call them *Indifferent in their use*, as well as in their own Nature; but for our parts, we take them in their *Use*, and as they are imposed on us, to be sinful, or, which is to us the *Tantamount*, very *Doubtful*, and what we cannot satisfy our Consciences about. And under this *Fallacy* it is that you shelter your self in the whole Harangue of your following Pages of this first *Section*.

For so you go on to prove, or to put Page 27. the best face you can upon the matter; and tell us,

1. *There is a necessity of imposing some things, which are Indifferent, or not particularly required by any Divine Precept; and for which you quote Mr. Corbett, and instance in some things, without which the Worship of God cannot be celebrated, nor can be performed with Decency, unless some Rule be prescribed about them.*

To which I am forced to answer, That one would think you had lost your Wits and your Conscience together. Are such things, without which the Worship of God cannot be celebrated or decently performed,

performed, *Indifferent* things? We are not now to enquire what they are, abstractly considered in their own nature, but as they stand related to the Worship of God. Surely that, without which God's Worship, either cannot be at all, or not decently performed, ought not to be called *Indifferent*, but *Necessary*, and that antecedent to the Command that requires it, and which alone can be the justifiable ground of the Command: To impose any thing that is not antecedently to the Imposition, necessary to the Preservation of the Peace, or Purity of the Church, in its Spiritual Ordinances and Administrations, belongs not to the *Executive*, but to the *Legislative Power*, and is an entrenchment on the Royal Prerogative of Christ, and is truly and properly *Sacrilegious*. Neither

2. Did the Apostles themselves ever practice the Imposing of any such things on the Churches of their own planting, who had certainly a greater Power of doing it, had it been lawful, than any since their days, whatever their Figure in the Churches be, could justly pretend to. But against this I find you have some Instances to produce, of what, you say, the Apostles did in this kind: And the first is, *Their observing* Page 30.
the First Day of the Week for the Christian Sabbath, in Commemoration of our Lord's Resurrection. I have no occasion here to treat of this Apostolical Institution, which hath been vindicated by so many others; only give me leave to ask you by the way, Whether you will put the *Christian Sabbath* among your *Indifferent Ceremonies* too? Your next Instance is, that of *Acts* 15. 28, 29. where few would have thought that you would have found your account. For here the Apostles being met in Council upon a Case that had been moved by the Judaizing Christians, who had been taught, by some that were too fond of their Rites and Ceremonies, to assert

the Obligation of the Ceremonial Law of *Moses* even on the Gentile Christians: 'Tis said, That to end this Contention, the Apostles decreed, by direction from the Holy Ghost, and not meerly by their own Authority, *to lay a Burden upon them*; and what *Burden*? Not of doing, but of forbearing some things, which sure is the highest kind of *Burden*. Neither did they intend that this should stand for a Perpetual, nor for an Universal Law to all the Churches, more than what was Moral in it. And you your self confess, that it was but an *Occasional and Temporary Order*, to preserve the Peace between these two sorts of Christians, till they should be better instructed in the Gospel-Doctrine and Constitutions. And besides, that which utterly spoils your Argument is, that they are called *Necessary things*, and for this very reason alone they enjoyn'd them. How *Indifferent* soever they were in their own nature, had they not been necessary in order to that necessary End, for which they were used as Means, they had not been enjoyn'd; so that 'twas not their bare Authority that made these *Indifferent* things *Necessary*, but the End, for which their Authority was exercised about them, which End made them *Necessary* antecedent to their imposing them. Again, If you consider the nature of the things enjoyn'd, which were not empty Ceremonies of their own late Invention, and which were to be observed and used as Modes or Means of Divine Worship as those are, which you plead for, and would impose on us, but the forbearing,

1. Of something that was morally Evil, as *Fornication*, which perhaps is here mention'd, because among the Gentiles, which was one of the Parties here concern'd; *Fornication* was not wont to be judged a Sin, as *Adultery* was.

2. Of *Meats* offered to Idols, or *Pollutions of Idols*, as ver. 20. Because it gave some Umbrage and appearance

appearance of Idolatry, and was matter of Scandal to the weaker Brethren, as *Crossing*, and *Bowing*, and *Kneeling*, and some other things now required of us, have done: But to avoid all appearances of Evil, is a Moral Duty, antecedent to any positive Precept about it.

3. *Of things Strangled, and of Blood.* 'Tis very probable this was added, as that wherein both the *Jews* and *Gentiles* were then well satisfied, it having been forbidden of God, not only to the *Jews*, by the Law of *Moses*, and from which the *Jews* could not, but by little and little, be weaned; but it being a part of the Precepts given to *Noah*, *Gen. 9. 4.* and to which all the *Jewish Proselytes at the Gate* were obliged to yield Obedience.

Lastly. If we consider the End, for which this Order and Determination was made; which was, to preserve Peace and Unity amongst the Dissenting Brethren, to which it was the properest Remedy that could be advised, and advised too by the Holy Ghost, as well as by the Apostles. But had they been such things as would certainly have divided the Church, and broken the common Peace of it, as the things requir'd of us have more than these hundred Years done, they would have been far from laying even this easie Burden upon them. And now, Sir, there needs but a just comparing of the Cases, to demonstrate the great Impertinency of this your second Instance.

Another of your Instances you have in the same Page, where you say, *St. Paul sometimes enjoyns External Rites, and sometimes alludes to them as things approved*; and quote for it *1 Tim. 2. 8.* where he says, *I will that Men pray every where, lifting up holy hands.* Here you think you have very happily found a pair of Rites in one Text; the one enjoyn'd, the other approv'd. And by how many degrees an Apostolical Approbation comes short of an Injunction, you

are not kind enough to inform us. The first, be sure, must be matter of Duty; and whether the other will be left at liberty, as a Work of Supererogation, I cannot tell. But that for which you pretend an Apostolical Injunction is this, *viz.* The *Lifting up of the hands in Prayer*. Now I ever thought that an Apostolical Injunction did carry with it a Sacred Authority, and an Obligation to Obedience, which willfully to neglect is damnably sinful. And the Apostle here giving his Precept so universally, without any Limitation of Persons, Times or Places, it must needs be universally and perpetually obligatory, and not only a Mode or Circumstance, but a part of the Worship that we pay to our Maker and Redeemer: And consequently he that Prays in any place, and with what kind of Prayer soever it be, without *Lifting up his hands*, sins against an *Apostolical Injunction*; And on what grounds then can he hope for the acceptance of his Prayers? This *Lifting up of the hands*, it seems by you, is a business of wonderful Force and Vertue, that a Man's Eternal Salvation doth, but a little more remotely, depend upon it. Again, to make the Devotion yet somewhat the more acceptable (or rather the more *Pharisaical*) you tell us *the Apostle approves*, and therein can do no less than recommend to our Practice, and that altogether as universally and unlimitedly, another very *Reverend and significant Ceremony*, and that is, *Washing the hands*. So that he that neglects to wash his hands in the Morning before he prays to God, must needs be in great danger of losing the benefit of his Prayers: For it seems, it is not enough to lift up the hands in Prayer, but it must be *Holy*, that is to say, *washed hands*. Now who would not take this plain state of the Case to be Confutation enough? But lest this should not satisfy you, we will consider it a little more nicely.

1. Then I grant, that *Lifting up the hands* is a Ceremony which is frequently, and may lawfully be used in the Acts of Religious Worship, whether Publick or Private: But then we must distinguish of Ceremonies, which are either *Natural* or *Instituted*. *Natural* Ceremonies are all such outward Signs, and visible Gestures or Actions, as either pure Nature, or general Custom, which is called a *Second Nature*, doth teach and prompt Men to, to express the Inward Worship of their Hearts and Minds by: And of this sort is *Lifting up of the Hands*, *Kneeling on the Knees*, *Falling prostrate on the Earth*, *Lifting up of the Eyes*, *Smiting on the Breast*, &c. Yea, and these things are not only the *Natural* Signs, but the Effects of Worship; in all which 'tis not any Law of Institution, but that of Nature and general Custom, that is to guide us, and which is not the same in all Persons, Times or Places, but every one is at liberty to express the inward Devotions of his Heart by such outward Signs as are ideopathically most proper to him, with a due regard to the general Rules of Reverence and Decency. But *Instituted* Ceremonies are such as are Signs only by *Institution*, and by which God is not acceptably worshipped, except they be of his own Institution, *Matt. 15. 9.*

2. As for the Ceremony of *Lifting up the hands* in Prayer, 'tis very weak (to say no worse) to imagine, that the Apostle made this any part of his *Apostolical Injunction*; both because 'twas what Nature it self was sufficient to prompt the Sincere Worshipper to, and therefore needed no other Law to oblige Men to it; and because a positive Injunction by an Apostle, was more than the Merit of so Indifferent a Ceremony, and which might be of ill Consequence in the After-ages of the Churches, either as a Snare, or as a Burden to many: For what is Apostolically enjoyn'd, may not, without Sin, be, in any case, or at any time, without an expresse Apostolical Allow-

ance, omitted: Besides, that such an Injunction would make it a part of Worship, and indispensibly necessary; and how would this tempt the Carnall sort of Worshippers to rest in, or to lay too great a stress on it, as if it were of equal Vertue, as the Duty of Prayer it self.

3. It is evident, that the Apostle's Design in this Scripture, was to press the *Duty of Prayer*, as a principal part of Christian Worship, and the Performance of it in the most Holy, Reverent, and Spiritual manner; and his mentioning the *Lifting up of the Hands*, is but in allusion to that Ancient Custom and Gesture which did so naturally attend it, and had so generally obtain'd in all Ages, and with all Mankind, that pretend to Worship a Heavenly Deity, that it is commonly used in Scripture to express the Duty of Prayer it self; so that what you make an Apostolical *Injunction*, is, at most, but an *Allusion*, which is ridiculous enough, as would appear by an hundred other like Expressions in Scripture. Yet this Ceremony, which is so naturally expressive of the hidden Man of the Heart, is not what we contend about; so that you do not force on it a positive Apostolical Precept, which would make it a part of the Worship, and is so forreign to the Apostle's Design in mentioning it.

As for your other Ceremony, which you would force into this Text, *viz.* of *Washing the hands*, methinks I should not need to say much, while I have to do with a *Christian*, and not a *Jew*. You say, the Apostle did approve of it. Indeed I do not think the Apostle was an Enemy to Cleanliness; but if he approv'd of it as a Religious Rite belonging to Christian Worship, (as you here urge it, or else your Instance is very impertinent.) I must tell you, he never learnt it of Christ his Lord and Master, who so expressly condemn'd it as a *Superstitious Tradition and Commandment of Men*, Matt. 15.9. Mark 7.7,8,9.

I cannot

I cannot but admire your wonderful Sagacity in discovering of those rare Jewels of *Rites* and *Ceremonies*; and how careful you are to gather up all the old venerable Relicks that have been justly cast away to the *Moles* and to the *Bats*, that you may adorn your Worship with them, and make Bonds and Fetters of them for your Brethren.

Your next Instance you take out of *Rom. 16. 16.* *Salute one another with an Holy Kiss.* Here you have discover'd another very useful Ceremony, and founded on the Authority of an Apostolical Command: It seems *Paul* was much for *Kissing*, else he would never have made a Law for the Preservation of so laudable a Custom. Now 'tis true, *Kissing* was in Fashion of old, long before *Paul's* days, among the *Hebrews*, as well as other *Nations*, and used as a Symbol of mutual Love and Peace; therefore *Peter* calls it, a *Kiss of Charity*, ἀσπάζεσθαι ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης, as that which *Nature*, and not any *Divine Institution*, directed Men to. And from hence their Greetings, or payment of Civil Respects to one another, whether present, or at a distance, were commonly called *Salutation*, whether by *Oscular Kissing*, or without it; for sure those that were at a distance could not well *Kiss*, unless it were in *Effigie*, or by *Proxy*. Now according to this Civil Custom that was among them, the Apostle writes to them to *salute one another with an Holy Kiss*: The Sense and Design whereof was plainly this, That whereas there had been Dissentions and Strifes among them, on the account of Meats and Days, &c. therefore he exhorts them, for the future, to forgive and forget all former Offences, to lay aside all these Contentions, and to embrace one another with a Christian Love and Affection, and to assure one another of their mutual Reconciliation, by all such lawful Ways and Means, as were proper to evidence it; and particularly, as occasion should

he offer'd, with a *Holy Kiss*; which he mentions, because 'twas the common *Civil Practice* of these Times. But withall admonishes them, that it must be an *Holy Kiss*: *Holy*, 1. In opposition to *typosy* and *Dissimulation*. 2. *Holy*, in opposition to *Wanton*, or *Unchast*. *Quonquam Paulus*

Vid. Spanb. non tam praecepit illud Osculum, sed Hist. Chri- imonuit ut Sanctum esset, castum, sincerum. And all this amounts but to a P. 619.

Direction how to use their *Civil Customs* in a Religious manner, and according to the *Holy Principles* and *Rules* of Christianity, which they ought to observe in their *Eating and Drinking* as well as in their *Salutations*, or any other *Action* of their *Lives*; which is far enough from the *Instituting* of a *Religious Ecclesiastical Rite*, to be observ'd, as an *Apostolical Sanction* in the Churches. For if this had been the *Design* of it, I would ask by whose *Equal Counter-Authority* was it that this Custom, so establish'd by the *Apostle*, was so soon after laid aside.

Lastly, One instance more of an *Apostolical Rite* you give us from, *1 Cor. 11. 4, &c.* That in their *Assemblies* (that is, when *Religious Worship* was in hand) the *Women* should have their *Heads cover'd* as a *Mark* of their *Subjection*, and the *Men* keep their *Heads uncover'd* as a *badge* of their *Power*. Now by the way we must observe, That the *Principal End* and *Design* of the *Apostle* herein, was not to shew the *Superiority* of the *Man* to the *Woman*; but to preserve the *Honour* and *Reverence* that was due to *Christ* and to his *Ordinances*, as he says, *ver. 3.* The *Head* of every *Man* is *Christ*, and thence infers, *ver. 4.* Every *Man* *Praying* or *Propheying* having his *Head cover'd*, dishonoureth his *Head*, i. e. *Christ*. So that the *Publick Worship* of *God* cannot be *Reverently* perform'd without a due regard to this *Rule*. And that this is a *Natural*, and no *Positively Instituted*

tuted Ceremony, the Obligation whereof depends meerly on its Institution, he argues at *ver. 14.* *Doth not Nature it self teach you, that if a Man have long Hair, it is a shame unto him?* To which he adds, as another Argument, The general Custom of the Churches, *ver. 16.* So that the Apostle doth not in the least pretend, by his Apostolical Authority, to institute Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of Christ, but only declares what Nature it self hath made comely in the Worship of God; and on that account recommends it to the Practice of the Churches. And now let any Impartial Judge say, how must this serve to the Vindication or Credit of the Ceremonies that lie in Controversy between us.

Yet hence you would conclude that the Apostle hath not only done these things himself, but hath left an Example, and therein a Warrant to other Governours of the Church, to press the Rules of Decency on the like occasions. Which indeed is warily enough express'd, if we may presume to understand your words as they lie; For I was always of Opinion, that whatsoever is inconsistent with that Holy Reverence and Decency that is Externally, as well as Internally due to the Worship of the Great God, ought to be suppress'd, and remedied by the application of such Means, as according to Scripture and Right Reason, are best adapted to that end. But here will lie the pinch of the Question still; By whom must it be Practically and Authoritatively determin'd, what is Decent, and what is not, and by what External Rites, Rules, or Devices the necessary Decency and Reverence shall be preserv'd. In answer to this, you tell us, *That those that succeeded the Apostles in their Office and Ministry, and either flourished in some part of their time, or in the next Age after them, followed their Example, and as they kept up the Customes which had been introduced before,*

fore, so they added others, when they thought it requisite. To which I reply,

1. Who were those that succeeded the Apostles in their Office and Ministry? For if you mean the Extraordinary Apostolical Office, you must prove that there were any that succeeded them in it, and that had that Power of Ordering and Governing the Churches as they had, or that that Office did not die with them. If you mean their General and Ordinary Office, as Ministers of the Gospel, wherein alone their Succession was continued in the following Ages, then by their Successors you can mean no more than Ordinary Church-Officers in general, or more particularly such of them as have the Oversight and Rule of that Sacred Order; and this indeed is what I would take to be your very meaning. Therefore,

2. Let me ask you, Whether the Ordinary Church-Rulers have the same Power and Authority, even within their own allotted Precincts, as the Apostles had, to impose on the Churches such Rites and Ceremonies as they shall think requisite or fit? Which you seem very plainly to assert, when you say, they followed the Apostles Example herein, and if so then are they, as to the Imposing Power, equal to the Apostles themselves. Yea,

3. How will you prove that the Apostles bare thinking any thing to be requisite, or fit, was a sufficient ground with them for the Imposing it on any of the Churches? Who in all their Determinations, were intirely govern'd, not by their own Wills, or Authority, but either by the Written Word, or by the Express Commands of their Lord Jesus Christ, or the Immediate Direction of the Holy Ghost, Acts 1. 24. Cb. 11. 12. Cb. 13. 2. Cb. 15. 28. And as appears by the Apostle Paul's Discourse upon the case of Marrying, or not Marrying, 1 Cor. 7. 6. 10. 12. and 25. compared. So that in truth
your

your Church-Rulers imposing things of this kind on the Churches, on this ground because they think it requisite, is not to follow the Example of the Apostles.

4. If Church-Rulers thinking a thing to be requisite be enough to justify their imposing it on the Churches, what Government is there in the World more Arbitrary, and fundamentally Tyrannical, than this of the Church, even where Christ hath with his own Mouth told us that he will have no Lordship Exercis'd, Luk. 22. 25, 26, and by his Apostle, that he allows no Lording it over his heritage, 1 Pet. 5. 3. Is not this the plain English of *Sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas*? And,

5. Will not this Position of your's justify all the Superstitions, Idolatries and Persecutions in the World? For that which is Sound and Orthodox Doctrine in England, is so in France, and Spain, and Italy and all the World over. If you say, not so, but the Word of God is the Rule, by which they are, or ought to be directed, yet how little will this mend the matter, while 'tis they themselves only that are allowed to be the Interpreters of this Rule? So that whatever the Rule be, 'tis by their *Think so*, and their *Will so*, that the Church must be resolved.

But then to prove this Matter of Right, you very Rationally and Schollar-like, produce matters of Fact. And tell us that those of the next Age after the Apostles did add other Rites and Ceremonies as they thought requisite. Here I might ask you by the way, What you mean by *Requisite*? Whether it be the same with *Required*, i. e. by the Word of God? If so, I know not who will blame them for that, especially if they thought right of what the World requir'd. Or whether by *Requisite*, you mean what they themselves *Thought so* in order to some Turn they had to serve by it, which is too commonly the

Byals

Byass of most Men's *Thoughts* in these cases? If so, I had need to say no more to it. But indeed by their adding and super-adding this sort of *Stuff*, they had at last fill'd the Church with that which set up the *Whore of Babylon* in all her *Formalities*, which is all the Service that ever things of this kind were good for.

But, whether it be to strengthen your *Argument*, or to shew your *Learning*, you proceed to several Instances of such things as have been by the Authority of Church-Rulers brought into the Church. And your first Instance is the *Solemn Fasts* which they commanded to be kept, when the necessity of the Times call'd for them. But this which was but an Occasional, and very Commendable exerting of their Ecclesiastical Authority, I hope you will not place among your Stated Rites, or Indifferent Ceremonies, which I wish were more Universally and Religiously observ'd as often as the Necessity of the Times do call for them. But besides these, you tell us of a great many other things, which were introduc'd in the Past-Apostolical Ages, about some of which, you say, they were generally agreed, and about others they differed and contended. As their *Weekly Fasts*, the Time of keeping Easter, the *Hours*, and the Gestures of Publick Prayers, and the Places for the People, according to their different States and Conditions, to sit in; their Trine-Immersion in Baptism, and the use of Sponsors; Forms of Profession of the Faith, and Abrenunciation; the White Garment, the Exsufflation, the Exorcism, the use of Milk and Honey, the Kiss of Peace, the Salt, the Burning Taper, the Signing with the Cross, the Imposition of hands upon the Baptized, the Consecration of the Oil, and the Anointing them with it, and much more, you say, you could have added, but that you thought it not necessary. But to what end have you given your self all this trouble to rake all this *Old Stuff* together for me, who

who knew enough of it before, as well as you, and perhaps before you had any occasion of knowing it, unless it be to inform the World how well the Apostles Successors have followed the Apostles Examples, as you say they did; and how prone the Nature of Man is to Superstition, and to deviate from the purest Rules of Institution; and by what Means and Methods Antichrist did rise to the height of Abomination; and what reason we have to endeavour a Reformation of the Churches Degeneracy, by returning to the Purer Fountain of Scripture Simplicity, Truth and Authority. But this, perhaps, you will not like, nor own for any part of your Design; but rather to clear the Innocency of your Church of England, *in that she hath fewer Ceremonies in all the Offices of her Service, as you say, than were used in that one Office of Baptism in the Primitive Church.* But you should first have told us, what it is that you call the *Primitive Church*, and how far you will carry that Title, whether to the Fourth, or to the Seventh, or the Tenth, or Thirteenth Century; or whether *Primitive* and *Old* be Synonymous Terms with you: And at this rate, indeed, you may justify the *Church of England*, a *Tanto*, and have some Pretence to make your Quarrel at me, for saying that no such things were imposed on the Churches by the Orthodox Fathers and Bishops of the First Ages, as the Conditions of Communion, as are now imposed on us; which I could easily demonstrate from the genuine and impartial Records of these Primitive Times, had it not been already sufficiently done by several others.

Vid. Spanb. Hist.
Clarkson. Liturg.

Your next Effort in your *First Section* is, to vindicate the *Imposition* of these Rites and Ceremonies on the Churches. And here you are pleased to tell us

Page 35.

1. That

1. That the Imposers, in these early Times, did not leave it indifferent to the People, whether they would obey their Lawful Injunctions or not. To which I answer.

1. I believe so too: For then their Imposing Power had been very insignificant, and utterly inconsistent with the Humour of an Imposing Spirit. But,

2. When you say, *These Early Times*, you do not tell us how Early you mean, or to what Century you will limit your *Early Times*. As for the First Century, you have very little of this kind to boast of, unless you will take in all the Fables that have been long enough since that Age, by the Impositions of After-times foisted into it: But in the Second Century and onward, Superstitions of all kinds began to spring up apace in most of the Churches; nor was it hard to persuade the People, so newly recover'd from their *Heathenism* and *Judaism*, especially in those days of Persecution, to an easie compliance with the Superstitious Orders of their Church-Guides, to whom they had committed the Conduct, not only of their Souls, but of their Temporal Affairs too. Nor were they, in that their Infancy, so capable of judging of that Sacred Rule, by which they ought to be guided and govern'd: And the best of their Leaders themselves, too ready to humour and oblige them with such *Ecclesiastical Toys*, as were apt to please Children; not foreseeing or considering to what a height of Superstition and Abuse, these little Indulgences and small Beginnings would in time run. For thus was the Ground-work of the *Antichristian Abomination* laid, even in the Second and Third Ages, which are call'd the purest Ages of the Church, but in many respects far enough from the Primitive Apostolical Simplicity. But as the Church grew more adult, and the ill Consequents of these Superstitious Principles, which at first were look'd upon as Innocent, began to

to appear in *Heresies*, *Schisms*, and a grosser sort of *Superstition*, there were not wanting some, tho' too few, that protested against the more intollerable of them, but too late to stem the swelling Tide, which by Custom and Carnal Interest had strengthened it self against them.

3. You may at your leisure further consider, how learnedly you go about to prove a Matter of *Right* by Matters of *Fact*. Such and such things have been done in the days of Yore, therefore it is lawful and just to do so still. At this rate, indeed, you may set up for a *Catholick Advocate* in any Place of the World, and in any Cause whatsoever, right or wrong; for what is there done, that hath not been before done? And for you to say, it is only their Lawful Injunctions that are to be obey'd, will not at all help the Matter, while 'tis only the Imposers themselves that are allow'd to be the Judges of its Lawfulness. Neither indeed is the bare *Lawfulness* of a thing, enough to justify its *Imposition*, or the Peoples *Obedience*, tho' imposed.

2. To apply your Historical Observations to the present Case, you say, *The Church of England lays no greater Weight upon the Ceremonies, than the Ancients did, but declares that they are things in their own nature Indifferent and Alterable; and that it is reasonable, and upon weighty and important Considerations, according to the various Exigency of Times and Occasions, such Changes and Alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in place of Authority should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient.* But how the Practice of the Church of England agrees with this her Declaration, is to most People a Paradox, while they see the Dissensions, Divisions and Persecutions, that have been occasion'd by their rigid Impositions; and yet after more than an hundred Years doleful Experience of it, and the many humble Supplications, Expostulations

tions and Long-sufferings of such as have been here-with offended, it is not to this day thought *Necessary* or *Expedient*, to make any Change or Alteration of them, unless it be for the worse, which gives some Men occasion to think, that it is the change of *Fewer* for *More*, and of *Bad* for *Worse*, that is the Church of *England's* meaning in it; especially when they reflect on the Overtures that were made, and the Plot that was laid for it in Bishop *Laud's* time, which is too fresh in the Memories of the present Age, to be yet forgotten.

But before you conclude this *Section*, Page 36. you would do something to obviate that *Noisse* and *Frivolous Objection*, as you call it, *That the Church makes these Ceremonies Conditions of Communion.* To which you have Two things to say.

1. *That some things must be allow'd, or we can have no Communion at all.* And here you instance in the *Particular Place, and Hour* of our meeting for *Divine Service*, and such *Means* as are for the preventing of *Disorder and Confusion*, which are not particularly determined in *Scripture*: And yet such things as these are necessarily made *Conditions of Communion*.

Tho' there hath been enough already said, to expose the Nakedness of this *Fallacy*; yet, should I not give you a particular attendance herein, perhaps you will triumph, and say, that I durst not appear before any of your best Arguments. Therefore in answer to this first Branch of your *Essay*, this one thing only I would demand, *Quid hoc ad Iphicli boves?* How little a-kin is this to the Question? Are the Ceremonies you are contending for as necessary, even *ex natura rei*, as Time and Place is for the Publick Acts of Religious Worship, without which 'tis impossible that it should be at all performed? Or as necessary, as that without which it cannot be performed, without Disorder and Confusion? If so,
How

How can you call them Indifferent things? Or would you tempt us to think, that it is Indifferent with you, whether God be worshipped or not? Or with what Disorder or Confusion it be done? 'Tis true, Particular Places and Hours of Publick Worship, are not so positively determin'd by the Scriptures, to Us under the Gospel, as once they were to the Jews; but yet, as for Time and Hours, the Morality of the *Fourth Commandment*, which requires a *Whole Day*, and *One in Seven*, to be kept Holy, in the Publick or Private Exercises of God's Worship, gives a General Rule, and the Circumstances of the People must determine what is most convenient and conducive to that Holy End: And whatsoever Rules are made in this Case, not according to the Fancies, or By-ends of the Ruled, nor of the Rulers, but according as the Nature and Circumstances of the Case require, they are Rules of God's own making, and not meerly of Man's: And whatsoever Rule is at any time made, without which the Worship of God cannot be performed at all, or not without Disorder and Confusion, let him be punished, for me, according to the merit of his Offence, that transgresses such a Rule. Of which sort there are more than enough, who own themselves to be of the Church of *England*, that care not how prophane-ly they walk, or talk, or play, or tittle away the *Lord's Day*, or whether ever they worship God or no, and yet are accepted of you, if but Zealous Enemies to Nonconformists.

2. But that the Burden may not lye too heavy on your dear little Ceremonies, you tell us, *That it is not out of an Opinion of any Vertue ascrib'd to them, but by Accident, (and a very unhappy Accident indeed it hath prov'd to be) as in all Governments, you say, things that are indifferent in their Nature, being enjoin'd, become Necessary in their Use. That thus the Matter of Humane Laws is often Indifferent, but the*

D

Observance

Observance of them not so ; For he that will be of a Society, must keep the Laws of it : Thus our Ecclesiastical Rites are declar'd to be Indifferent, but our Obedience to those that rule over us, is groundd on an expresse Command of God, and is an essential part of our Christianity; the wilful neglect of it therefore, would exclude us from Heaven, &c. To which I reply.

i. That here we have a rare Specimen both of your Divinity and of your Charity.

i. Of your Divinity ; and that not only in your measuring the Temple of God by the Kingdoms of the Earth, and Levelling Religion with Worldly Policy, and Conscience with Carnal Interest, as if Obedience in Matters of Religion were to be set at the same degree of Latitude with that of Worldly Governments, and that Mens Consciences ought to be as brawny as their Shoulders: But in laying down this general and unlimited Position, That in all Governments (Church Government not excepted) things that are Indifferent in their Nature, being enjoin'd, become necessary in their use. How long shall we hear these Vain words ? When will you be asham'd of this Refuge of Lies, where you always take Sanctuary, to the Reproach of the Christian Religion ? Sir, How few are there of Actions, or Things in the World, that are not in their own Nature, simply consider'd, Indifferent ? What an Imensity of Arbitrary Power then have you ascrib'd to your Church-Rulers ? Is not this Doctrine as true all the World over, where-ever any Humane or Religious Laws are to be found, as it is in England ? Let me ask you seriously, Should all the Superstitious, yea, Idolatrous Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Rome, or of any other People in the World, that pretend to the Worship of a Deity, be requir'd of you by the Rulers of your Church, as the Conditions of Communion with them, must you not, by your own avow'd Doctrine, think your self bound to

to obey them? But what you would do in such a case, I cannot tell. Would you plead that you are not satisfied in the Lawfulness of their Commands, that it is gross Superstition or Idolatry that is requir'd of you? Would they not presently choak you with your own Doctrine, and tell you, as you now tell us, *That your Obedience to those that Rules over you, is grounded on an expresse Command of God, and is an Essential part of your Christianity? That the things required of you, are in their own natures Indifferent, and therefore being requir'd, are become necessary in their use?* Will they not from your own mouth tell you, *That for you to plead the Priviledge of a Private Judgment, or the Sentiments and Perswasion of your own Consciences, is Disloyally, Schismatically, Proudly and Puritannically to oppose your Private against the Publick Judgment and Authority of the Church?* Sir, Is not this the *Hobbean Divinity* that you are here Preaching to us? And if you will be angry with us for not embracing it, we cannot help it. Perhaps you will tell us, that there is no Idolatry nor Superstition in the Things requir'd of us; Will not *Rome* and *Constantinople*, and all the *Religionists* in the World tell you the same, and will you take it so upon their own word? Is not every Church Orthodox in Doctrine, and Pure in Worship to it self? Who are there that will own themselves Hereticks, or Idolaters? But if the Publick Judgment must determine for one, why not for all. Yet pray do not say that I am now comparing the Church of *England* to the grossest Idolaters in the World, or the *Church-Services* to *Asses Heads*, or *Doves Dung*, while I am but giving you the true Anatomy of your own Doctrine, and the Inferences which naturally and necessarily derive from it, and from which I know not how you can fairly deliver your self.

2. Of your *Charity*; In that you exclude us from Heaven, and cut us off from the Body of the Church

of Christ, and cast us out to perish in a State of Infidelity or Apostacy, because we cannot be persuaded to be of your Opinion and Way in the External Modes and Rites of your Worship; For all the Charity you pretend to, is but to Proselyte us to your Party, and in that wherein the Essentials of Religion are not at all concern'd; and herein, if you cannot prevail, you pronounce us *Damn'd*, just as the *Papists* tell those whom they call *Hereticks*.

2. Had I a mind to Droll upon you, I might find occasion enough, when you say, that it is by Accident that these things come to be imposed, as Conditions of Communion with you. But I will not study to provoke you.

Now for a Conclusion of this *Section* with you: Methinks 'tis pretty Comical to see with what a Complaisance you can hug every Author you meet with, Canonical or Apocryphal, whether *Canterbury*, *York* or *Geneva*, where you find the words *Decency* and *Order* applied to the advantage of a Christian Community, and how excellently *Calvin* himself speaks, and *Baxter* too, when they recommend these things to Christian Practice, as if you were sure they must needs intend the same thing by it as you do, and thought it impossible to preserve *Decency* and *Order* in Church-Communion, without your Rites and Ceremonies. But pray Sir, when

Calv. Instit.
lib. 4. c. 10.
Señ. 27.

you quote *Calvin* next, deal more ingenuously with him; It had been no great matter for you, while your hand was in, to have translated the other three lines of his Paragraph, but that, it seems, it was not so much for your turn; but give me leave now to do it for you. Yet this (says he) is always to be accepted in these Observances (or Rites) that they be neither thought necessary to Salvation, so as religiously to bind the Conscience; or that they so conduce to the Worship of God, as that Religion should be placed in them. Nor doth he allow

allow any other Laws about Decency and Order, but what conduce to the Peace and Safety of the Church.

Upon the whole, I conclude, and dare appeal to any that can but read and construe him, that *Calvin* hath done you very little Service in this matter.

SECT. II.

Your Second *Section* gives one a little pleasanter Diversion, being only a Collection of certain Articles relating to the Controversy, wherein it seems, we are notionally agreed, if we do but rightly understand one another's Notions; and wherein, if upon Examination, we persevere not to agree, I hope it shall appear to be not my fault, but yours.

1. You say that *I agree that Schism is a Sin*. Ay Sir, that I do, and none of the least of Sins neither, tho' I do not think it to be the *Sin against the Holy Ghost*, as some of you have affirm'd; no nor as bad as Idolatry, or Murder, or Atheism. There are degrees of Sin, and so there are of Schism, tho' the least degree of what is truly Schism is very Culpable. As for your old Distinction of *Venial* and *Mortal*, I shall leave to those that are nearer a-kin to *Rome*, than ever I desire to be.

2. You say, *We are agreed, That Schism, in the Notion of it which we are upon, is a Causeless breach of Ecclesiastical Communion*. On this Head I told you, Page 18, 19. That by this Limitation of your Definition of *Schism*, you gave us to understand, that it was not the Whole, but only a Branch of *Schism*, that you are discoursing of, and indeed one of the Least and Remotest Branches of it; yet which, if *causeless*, we will grant it to your Definition to be *Schismatical*; and so far we agree still.

3. We are agreed too, That the higher the Degree of a real Schism is, and by what Circumstances soever it be aggravated, the greater is the Sin. And under this, your Fourth Agreement also is com-

prehended. Thus far we agreed in the Theory, tho' I did then, and do still oppose you in your Application of it.

P. 41, 42.

4. Lastly, *That the Effects of Schism are very grievous*, I easily did, and do still agree. Hence you triumphantly infer, That one would think it should be no difficult matter to prove our *Separation* to be *Causeless* and *Unnecessary*, especially considering that I further granted,

1. *That the Church of England is a True Church of Christ, in which Salvation is to be obtain'd.*

2. *That it is Lawfull to Communicate with the Church of England.* To which you should have added my next Words, *viz.* That it is not absolutely, or in it self Sinful so to do. But I find, you use to quote your Authors at this Rate. Yea,

3. That we once thought our Lay-Conformity to be our Duty, nor have we repented of those our thoughts to this day, nor acted any thing that is inconsistent with them.

4. Lastly, You Invidiously upbraid me with *granting more than you demanded, and more than you can receive*; and say, that I contend, that it is still the *Bounden Duty* of our Brethren, remaining such, to *Communicate with you, if it be to qualify them for an Office.* Sir, this is in more respects than one, far from fair. My Words were these, It is every Man's Bounden Duty to serve God and his Country, as also to provide for Himself and his own Family, with all those Intellectual and Corporeal Abilities, wherewith God hath blest him, according as there are Occasions and Calls to it: Therefore nothing that is tollerable, and not plainly sinful, tho' burdensome and uneligious, ought to restrain us from the Service of God, or Man, which we are fitted for and called to. But to this I there added, If there be any that have made these External Compliances, *reunente Conscientia*, or but with a Doubt-
ing

ing Conscience, let them look to it, and repent of their Sin. Now of this Opinion I am still, whether you like it or no. And what Service all these Concessions of mine will do you in the Cause in hand, is what comes next to be considered.

Sect. III.

Now, you say, you are come to the P. 44.
Things chiefly in Debate between us: For hitherto it seems (to use your own words) you have been but *fighting with your own Shadow*. And this you have divided into Three Queries.

Q. 1. *Whether the Separation of the Dissenters from the Church of England, be not Causeless? Which you think is easily to be resolv'd from my own fore-mention'd Concessions.* But to shew my pretended Inconsistency, you shew your own foul Disingenuity, in the wrested and partial Quotations you make of my Letter. You say, *That in defiance of my Concessions, I argue, that our Separation is our bounden Duty, and quote my Page 17.* where my words were, If we unite with you in all that the Word of God requires us to unite in, the fault will not be Ours: If we depart and separate from you in those Articles that are not of the Faith, that was once deliver'd to the Saints, or in those Acts of Worship and Outward Communion, which we have no Warrant in Scripture for, but general Cautions against, then our Separation will not (by this Principle of your's) be damn'd by you as Schismatical, but must be acknowledged (as we verily believe it) to be a part of our *Bounden Duty*. And what can you deny of all this? Only you presume that our Separating from you is *Causeless*, before you have prov'd it, or we granted it; which is that piteous begging the Question, of which you are always guilty. The rest of your Quotations, which I shall not trouble my self, nor the Reader to recite, are

of the same fashion, which declares how little honesty there is in them, and how little they deserve to be regarded.

Yet that you may seem to make something of my Concessions, beyond what any sober Man could ever have wrested them to, you fall into a Raving *Delirium* of querying, which is not worth a Repetition ; but the Sum of it is this ; *How Pa.45. to 59. the same thing that is Sinful at one time, and under some Circumstances, can possibly be Lawful, much less a Duty at another time and under other Circumstances ; & vice-versa.* This is the Paradox, which you say you cannot understand ; the things you are not Artist enough to bring to an agreement. To which I answer,

What your Art is to bring things to an Agreement, I cannot tell, but find that you have a special faculty at setting things at Variance. That which I so briefly offer'd on this Head in my *Letter*, hath, it seems, instead of satisfying, cast you into this loud *Paroxysm*, which hath held you thoroughout these Fourteen Pages of your *Vindication* ; but could I be so happy as to relieve you of the *Phrenzy*, there might be some hope of reducing you to a better degree of Sobriety. Wherefore that I may represent the matter to your Understanding in as open and clear a Light as I can ; I shall endeavour,

1. To remove that false *Medium*, thro' which you always take your Observations, to the prejudice of the Truth ; which is this, *viz.* That *Imposing Power* which you ascribe *de jure*, to Church-Rulers, in things in their own nature Indifferent, and not particularly forbidden in the Holy Scriptures ; which I have already prov'd to be your great Error, and have particularly answer'd to all the Instances which you have here brought to confirm it. But if this *Imposing Power* be not deriv'd from Christ, nor according to the Holy Scriptures, then

is it an *Innovation*, and an *Usurpation*, and to disobey it, is no culpably Disobedience, but our Duty. And if so, then is the whole Nerve of your Argument broken. But you are so deeply possess'd with an Imagination, that those whom you so revere, and expect all your *Ecclesiastical Preferments and Dignities* from, must have an Arbitrary Power in all these things which you call Indifferent, that they can at their pleasure, and by their meer Commands, make them *Necessary*; than which there is nothing more contrary to the Rules and Practice of the Apostles, nor more destructive of the Simplicity and Free State of the Gospel, or of the Peace and Quiet of the Church. So that the unwarrantable Interposition of an *Imposing Authority*, is so far from turning an *Indifferent* and *Unnecessary* thing into matter of Duty, that it makes it to be Sin. 'Tis true, tho' the Gospel grants us a Liberty of using Indifferent things Indifferently, yet if this Liberty be abus'd to Licentiousness, or us'd Disorderly, or Scandalously, such Disorder and Scandal, being Morally Evil, ought to be restrain'd by the Ecclesiastical Authority; but to use them as of Necessity, meerly on the account of Human Authority, is Superstition, which ought to be protested against. Tell us no more then of Disobeying Church-Rulers in those things, wherein they abuse their Authority, and enslave the Consciences of Men.

2. For one and the same thing to be *Lawful*, yea perhaps *Necessary* at one time, and under some Circumstances, and yet very *Unlawful* at another time and under other Circumstances, methink should not seem so unintelligible an Inconsistency to a Man of your Sense in other matters. Is it not the Nature and true Definition of all Indifferent things, consider'd as such, that they are (Morally taken) a *Medium*, or sort of Middle things equally plac'd between Two Extrems of Good, and the opposite Evil,

Evil, in Themselves neither Good, nor Evil; but, as a Ballance in *aequilibrio*, equally in

Vid. Bradsh. Treatise of things Indiff. clin'd to either Extream; so that according to incidental Circumstances, they are sometimes Good and some-

times Evil? Is it hard then to understand how an Indifferent thing, (such as you say your Ceremonies are) and Consequently a Compliance, with them, may be Lawful at one time, and yet Sinful at another, according as the Circumstances of Cases do vary; As to the *Rationale* of this, I might easily here enlarge, but for brevity sake, which I design, shall refer you to Mr. *Bradshaw's Treatises of Worship and Ceremonies*: And to Mr. *Corbet's Remains*, &c.

Yet you make the Sense of this Case obvious enough to meaner Understandings than your's, there is a plenty of Instances, both Sacred and Common, that readily offer themselves. The *Shew-bread* under the Law was in it self a Thing Indifferent; but by the Ordinance of God about it, was Sacred, and not

Lawful to be eaten but by the Priests only; yet *David* and his Men, when they were hungry, and had no other

Bread ready, did eat it, and not Sin in so doing, which had they done at another time, and under other Circumstances, they had been guilty. The Apostles Themselves, while among the *Jewish* Converts, at least in the Infancy of their Gospel-Constitution, did observe (by a Divinely allowed Indulgence to them) very many of the old *Jewish* Rites and Ceremonies, as the Circumstances of the Times made Lawful and Necessary to do; but to have done these things among the Gentiles, yea, or among the *Jews*, after their City and Temple were destroy'd, would have been Sin. So that the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of such things as these depends not on their Indifferency, nor on any Human Impositions, but on those Circumstances that do attend

tend them, with relation to the Necessities of Life, or the Churches Edification and Peace. How many Thousand Instances might there be taken from Men's common Practice and Conversation, of things that are very Lawfully, Honestly, and Necessarily done at some times, and under some Circumstances, which would be very Evil, Unjust, Ridiculous, or Scandalous at some other times, which the meanest Capacity may be *Artist* enough to comprehend.

3. In things purely Indifferent, that stand equally determinable to Lawful or Unlawful, the least supervening Circumstance of a necessary Good, or a Good necessarily depending on it, makes it to be no more Indifferent, but Good and Necessary, according to the Nature and Degree of that Good that so depends upon it ; and on the contrary, the least Kind or Degree of Evil makes it to be Evil : So that in determining the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of things Indifferent, we must strictly and faithfully examine what that Good or Evil is, that necessarily depends on them, or will be the Consequents of them. Hence it is that the Rites and Ceremonies now in Controversy, being in Themselves things Indifferent, tho' in some respects Evil in their Use, yet as far as they are over-ballanc'd by a preponderating Good, to which, under present Circumstances they necessarily conduce, they are Lawfully submitted to ; but farther than that necessary Good End is attainable by them, they are justly rejected as Evil. But here, as an evident indication of your Envy, you suggest, that the Good that at any time preponderates with us, to a Passive Conformity to some of your Ceremonies, is only *the serving of a Turn in some Worldly Interest*, wherein you do but declare to the World how you gnash your teeth to see any of us in the Interests of the Civil Government, tho' but in any of it's meanest Offices. But how far the Duty of Publick Service-

ableness,

ableness, and Self-preservation is a Good that preponderates the Evil of them, I shall not here any farther enquire, nor add any more to what I have already said to it; but do assure you, that there are Considerations of a higher and more Catholick Nature, that have been the more prevalent Arguments with us, to conform, so far as we have at any time done, to your Impositions; As partly, the necessity we have been under of Worshiping God with you, or not at all, judging your Ceremonious Worship more eligible than an utter deprival; and partly to avoid the Violence of your Persecutions, when they have been hottest against us, and wherein we have consulted not only, and perhaps not so much, our own Personal Quiet and Safety, (tho' that might justify us, as well as it did *Paul* once at *Jerusalem*) as to prevent the more destructive breaches that your Flames might else make in the Church, and your running your selves, and the whole Kindom into the deeper both Personal and National guilt of Persecution: But when there are not these, or the like great Ends to overballance the Evil of them, we take it as part of our Duty to refuse Conformity to them.

4. We must Distinguish too, between an *Occasional*, and a *Stated*; and between a *Laick*, and a *Clerical* Conforming.

1. Between an *Occasional*, and a *Stated* Conforming. These Two are vastly different; proceed from different Principles; and must be rul'd by different Measures. A Man may very Lawfully do some things *Occasionally*, according to present Reasons and Exigencies, which to do *Statedly* would be Sinful. For this we have the Example of the Apostle *Paul* for our Direction and Warrant, and which is agreeable to the Common Reason of Mankind, if either of these be of any Authority with you. As great as the Objections were which the
Apostle

Apostle had against the Jewish Ceremonies, as in several places of his Epistles he declares, yet he could Occasionally Conform to them, as I told you more particularly in my First Letter to you; yet notwithstanding his Occasional Conforming to them, he declares that he will not be brought under the Power of them, 1 Cor. 6. 12. My short Gloss upon this Text you were pleas'd to ridicule, and to call it grossly Ignorant. In Page 55. indeed I did not then think it necessary to give a full Exposition of the Text, but only took notice of it as far as it confirm'd my Hypothesis, and was agreeable to the Apostles common Practice. The words are, *All things are Lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient; all things are Lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.* I confess this is a Text, about which Interpreters are not well agreed. The Sense which you make of it is only this; *That he speaks of Meats and Drinks, or Things of that Nature; His meaning (say you) is that how ever he had Liberty to use them, he would not be under their Dominion, as the Epicures were; he would not be a Servant to his Appetite, &c.* And this you suppose is all that is to be made of this Text. But had it been for your turn, you would have examin'd it a little more strictly. *All things are Lawful unto me, but all things are not Expedient.* What can the Apostle here mean by *Lawful things*, which are not always *Expedient*, but such things as are of an *Indifferent* Nature, that are *Lawful in Themselves*, but not always so in their *Use*, and of which he speaks *Universally and Indefinitely*, laying down this as a General Rule about *Things Indifferent*, the Lawfulness of whose Use must always be determined by their Circumstances.

Then he instances particularly in Two things, viz. *Meats and Fornication: Meats*, that is, such *Meats*, the Lawfulness of whose use might be conscientiously

scientiously scrupled by any, which were either such as God had forbidden the Jews by the Law of *Moses*, or *Meats offered to Idols* by the Gentiles, of which he treats more particularly Chap. 8. and determines that the *Meats* are in themselves *Lawful and Good*; but if they be not used without giving offence, either to a Man's own Conscience, or to a weak Brother, are so far *Inexpedient* and become *Unlawful*. But why doth he here joyn *Fornication* with things *Indifferent*? Not because it was really so, but because it was not so. They had been taught in their *Gentilism*, that tho' *Adultery* was a Sin, as being a Violation of the Marriage-bed, yet *Fornication* was none, but a matter *Indifferent*, and which had also been a part of the impure Doctrine of the *Nicholaitans* among the Christians: Therefore the Apostle joyns this with things *Indifferent*, to convince them of their gross mistake, and to shew them the Moral Evil of it; upon which Head he goes on to the end of the Chapter. But in this twelfth Verse he speaks only of things *Indifferent* in general, whose Lawfulness or Unlawfulness depends upon present Circumstances. *All things* (says he) that is, all things of the truly *Indifferent* kind, *are Lawful for me*; here he asserts his *Christian Liberty*; but I will not be brought under the power of any *ἐν ἐγὼ ἐξουσιάζομαι ὑπὲρ τινος*. of any, either Person or Thing. *Super me nemo potestatem habebit*, say some, or *Ego nulli rei mancipabor*, as others. The Sense is still the same; I will not be brought under the *Power, or Authority*, of any *One*, for so the word *ἐξουσιάζομαι* properly signifies. I will not have my Conscience bound nor imposed on, to the Violation of my *Christian Liberty* in these things. But according to your Interpretation, all that the Apostle here says is, That he will not be brought under the Power of Meat and Drink, so as to use them to Gluttony, Drunkenness or Intemperance, to the pampering of the Flesh:

And

And indeed I believe the Holy Apostle had never any mind to make so ill a use of them, who made it so much his care to *keep under his Body, and to bring it into Subjection.* But what then, were Gluttony, and Drunkenness, and Intemperance, some of those Lawful things, which he says he will not be brought under the power of, as your Interpretation doth necessarily imply? For 'tis undeniable, that they are the Lawful things he is here speaking of, and that consider'd as simply Lawful, and that he says he will not be brought under the Power of, and to this Sense his constant Doctrine and Practice was agreeable, *Gal. 2. begin.* We have there a report of a Case full enough to this purpose, where he tells us, that when he went up to *Jerusalem* with *Barnabas* and *Titus*, he communicated to them the Gospel [*i. e.* that free and unceremonious way of the Gospel] which he had preached among the *Gentiles*, but privately, to them which were of Reputation, that is, the Apostles, and some others of the most eminent Christians, who understood the Liberty of the Gospel; to these he declar'd the Manner and Way of his Ministry among the *Gentiles*, that he might have their Suffrage and Approbation of it, and not seem to be singular to the prejudice of his Ministry; and yet he was constrained to do it *privately*, to prevent an Uproar among the Bigots of the Jewish Converts. Yet notwithstanding this Privacy, there were some unawares brought in, whom he calls *False Brethren*, because Enemies to the Christian Liberty and Simplicity of the Gospel, who came in *privily*, to spy out this his Liberty, and to have compell'd *Titus*, being a Greek, to be Circumcised, and to bring the *Gentiles* into the same Bondage of Ceremonies with the *Jews*; To whom, says the Apostle, we gave place by Subjection, no not for an hour, *i. e.* not in the least Point, nor for the least space of Time. Again, at *Ver. 11.* when *Peter* was come to him at *Antioch*,
and

and at first began to hold Communion with *Paul* and his *Gentile-Church* there, but after that certain Men of the Jewish Communion came from *James*, from *Jerusalem*, not only fell off from the *Gentiles*, and joyn'd with the *Jews* (which proves them to be then Two Distinct Communion) but would have compelled the *Gentiles*, as it were by an Ecclesiastical *Act of Uniformity*, to Conform to the Ceremonies of the *Jews*, *Paul* stoutly withstood him to the Face, because he was therein to be blamed. And therefore he exhorted them, Chap. 5. 1. *To stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and not be entangled again with that Yoke of Bondage.* Now, Sir, this is what I have at present to say, for the Sense that I gave of 1 Cor. 6. 12. and whether my Interpretation of it, or yours, be the more Ridiculous, we must leave to competent impartial Judges. And so much for the first Distinction, of an *Occasional*, and a *Stated* Conforming.

2. There is a *Laick* and a *Clerical* Conforming. The *Lay-Conformity*, being meerly Passive, Occasional, and enforced by such Reasons, and Circumstantial Considerations, as did preponderate to render that to be Expedient, which was not in it self absolutely Sinful, was much more Tolerable than the required *Clerical* Conformity, therefore this was, tho' not of choice, yet patiently submitted to, as long and as far as these Reasons did make it Necessary and Expedient, in order to a Publick, as well as a Private Good. So that you need not have made a Wonder to see us do that at one time, which we cannot do at another, and you might have forborn your Uncharitable and Unjust Reflexions upon it. But as for *Clerical* Conformity, which is Active, and implies a State of Communion with you, and which was burden'd at a much higher rate, with such Oaths, Subscriptions, Abjurations, &c. as were never before heard of since the Reformation, this could not be at

all submitted to, by such as did Conscientiously scruple it; No Circumstance could relieve us in this case. And the Nature and Terms of this Conformity are so much the same still, that our Practice must be the same. But as for those few Novices that have gone from us to the Church of England, who never duly consider'd the Grounds of their Nonconformity, we neither expect nor desire their Return to us, unless on better Principles. So then, here you cannot say, *That we thus Conform'd before the Toleration, and since have forsaken you.* This, I suppose, is sufficient to vindicate what I said in my Letter on this Head, against all those Exceptions of yours, that are worth the regarding. But,

5. Before I quite dismiss it, I must take a little notice of your Huffing Resentment of a certain Familiar Similitude, which in my Letter I gave you from 2 Kings 6. 25. of that Siege at Samaria, where the Famine was so extream, that they began to eat their own Children, and an Asses head was sold for Four-score pieces of Silver, and a fourth part of a Kab of Doves Dung for five pieces of Silver. This you call so Impudent and Profane, that you cannot reflect on it without a just Indignation, and (which is more to be regarded) that a Learned Gentleman, who is a Dissenter, but otherwise a Person of great Sense, declar'd to you his Abhorrence of it. And the truth is, the use that you have made of it, deserves every one's Abhorrence. You say, *That I herein compare the most Sacred Ordinances of God, administer'd by the Church of England, to Asses heads, and to filthy Excrements.* Sir, I doubt your Passion hath now put you a little besides your Reason. Who would not have thought that a Man of your Education and Figure, might have discern'd some little difference between Comparia and Similia, and that you must needs have learnt long ago, that *Omne Simile est dissimile, & Similia non sunt Quadrapedia?* Is it my Sin, and mine alone, to compare

E

Spiritual

and at first began to hold Communion with *Paul* and his *Gentile-Church* there, but after that certain *Men* of the *Jewish Communion* came from *James*, from *Jerusalem*, not only fell off from the *Gentiles*, and joyn'd with the *Jews* (which proves them to be then *Two Distinct Communions*) but would have compelled the *Gentiles*, as it were by an *Ecclesiastical Act of Uniformity*, to Conform to the Ceremonies of the *Jews*, *Paul* stoutly withstood him to the Face, because he was therein to be blamed. And therefore he exhorted them, *Chap. 5. 1. To stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and not be entangled again with that Yoke of Bondage.* Now, Sir, this is what I have at present to say, for the Sense that I gave of *1 Cor. 6. 12.* and whether my Interpretation of it, or yours, be the more Ridiculous, we must leave to competent impartial Judges. And so much for the first Distinction, of an *Occasional*, and a *Stated* Conforming.

2. There is a *Laick* and a *Clerical* Conforming. The *Lay Conformity*, being meerly *Passive*, *Occasional*, and enforced by such *Reasons*, and *Circumstantial Considerations*, as did preponderate to render that to be *Expedient*, which was not in it self absolutely *Sinful*, was much more *Tolerable* than the required *Clerical* Conformity, therefore this was, tho' not of choice, yet patiently submitted to, as long and as far as these *Reasons* did make it *Necessary* and *Expedient*, in order to a *Publick*, as well as a *Private Good*. So that you need not have made a *Wonder* to see us do that at one time, which we cannot do at another, and you might have forborn your *Uncharitable* and *Unjust Reflexions* upon it. But as for *Clerical* Conformity, which is *Active*, and implies a *State of Communion* with you, and which was burden'd at a much higher rate, with such *Oaths*, *Subscriptions*, *Abjurations*, &c. as were never before heard of since the *Reformation*, this could not be at

all submitted to, by such as did Conscientiously scruple it; No Circumstance could relieve us in this case. And the Nature and Terms of this Conformity are so much the same still, that our Practice must be the same. But as for those few *No-vices* that have gone from us to the Church of *England*, who never duly consider'd the Grounds of their Nonconformity, we neither expect nor desire their Return to us, unless on better Principles. So then, here you cannot say, *That we thus Conform'd before the Toleration, and since have forsaken you.* This, I suppose, is sufficient to vindicate what I said in my *Letter* on this Head, against all those Exceptions of yours, that are worth the regarding. But,

5. Before I quite dismiss it, I must take a little notice of your Huffing Resentment of a certain *Familiar Similitude*, which in my *Letter* I gave you from *2 Kings* 6. 25. of that Siege at *Samaria*, where the Famine was so extream, that they began to eat their own Children, and an *Asses head* was sold for *Four-score pieces of Silver*, and a fourth part of a *Kab* of *Doves Dung* for five pieces of Silver. This you call so *Impudent and Profane*, that you cannot reflect on it without a just *Indignation*, and (which is more to be regarded) that a *Learned Gentleman*, who is a *Dissenter*, but otherwise a *Person of great Sense*, declar'd to you his *Abhorrence* of it. And the truth is, the use that you have made of it, deserves every one's *Abhorrence*. You say, *That I herein compare the most Sacred Ordinances of God, administer'd by the Church of England, to Asses heads, and to filthy Excrements.* Sir, I doubt your *Passion* hath now put you a little besides your Reason. Who would not have thought that a *Man* of your Education and Figure, might have discern'd some little difference between *Comparia* and *Similia*, and that you must needs have learnt long ago, that *Omne Simile est dissimile, & Similia non sunt Quadrupedia*? Is it my Sin, and mine alone, to compare

E

Spiritual

Spiritual things with Temporal? Or was not this Similitude apt enough to the Case to which it was applied? The Design whereof was but to mind you of what extream Necessity will tempt Men to, and warrant them in, which was once our case in respect of Church-Communion, when we could not (thro' the Violence of your Persecutions) obtain what we would, and ought to have had, but were forced to make use of what we could get: Nor indeed was I aware that (in reverence to you) it was my duty to alter, or expunge any of the words of the Sacred Story. But it seems 'twas the *Asses Head* and the *Doves Dung* that gave you this great disgust, and turn'd your Stomach against me, to which you say, *I compar'd your Divine Services*. But sure, a very small *Tantillum* of your Spirit of Charity, if rightly drawn and applied, might have a little sweetned the Matter, and have perswaded you to believe, that I could not be so Profane, as to compare them to such things, as they were *Divine Services*, but only as far as they were of *Humane Invention*, and the *Defilements of Divine Worship and Institutions*, and Dead Carcasses, that are fitter for the Grave than for God's Altar; which the Apostle calls *Weak and Beggary Elements*, Gal. 4. 9. and God himself calls a *Smoke in his Nose*, Isa. 65. 5. and an *Abomination to him*, Chap. 1. 13. When we could have no publick Worship, but what was blended with your Offensive Ceremonies; and instead of Sound and Edifying Doctrine, must be serv'd with the jejune Stuff, or the bitter Railings of an Ignorant or Debauch'd Priest, as was the Case of very many Congregations in the Land, was not our Case in Spirituals, too well like the Famine in *Samaria*, God himself having taught us to compare it to a *Famine*, *Amos* 8. 11. yet how unschollar-like have you wrested and stretch'd this *Simile* beyond what it was design'd for, or would reasonably bear. Had I compar'd

compar'd our Saviour to a *Lyon*, would you say I had call'd him a *Beast of Prey*? Or had I compar'd him to a *Thief*, had I therein call'd him a *Deceiver*? Who is it then that hath put the *Horses Head to the Man's Neck*? And here I cannot but observe one of your more notable Distortions of my words, which makes me think that your own Wits were a little Convuls'd, in expounding my word *Monopoliz'd*, for *Eating and Drinking*, and *Gormandizing*, as if *Monopolizing* were the same with *Monophagizing*, which if you had but seasonably thought on, might have sav'd you one whole Page of your Scribble. Again, whether it be to soften the Text, or to make my Similitude look a little awry, you have found out some Interpreters, that have thought the *Samaritans* bought the *Doves Dung* for *Fewel*, or for the Manuring of their Ground, or for the Salt that is in it; or else it only signifies some *vile sort of Meat or Pulse*; any thing, you think, would do better than the Literal Sense. As for the *Asses head* then, there is not like to be any Question; but if the *Doves Dung* were bought for *Fewel*, which would be but a dull kind of Fire, I doubt it would have been more chargeable than the Meat that was dress'd by it, the fourth part of a *Kab* being but *half a Pint*, and that at six shillings and three-pence price: Nor could it be much more probable that it was for the *Manuring of the Ground*, especially while they had no Ground, but that within the Walls, to Manure; Wherefore it must certainly be for *Food*, as the *Asses head* was, and which was the only thing the *Famine* requir'd. But what part of the *Dung* it was, is not certain, whether that in the *Crop*, which was not yet digested, or whether it comprehended all the *Entrails*, which were wont to be cast away with the *Dung*; or rather, whether the word may not signify, according to the *Arabick*, a kind of *Cicer*, which was esteem'd a very course sort of Food; and if so,

then I hope the Similitude will not be altogether so foul, nor offensive, as you have endeavour'd to represent it, nor had you need to have held your Nose at it. And now, Sir, after all this pother about an *Ass's Head* and a little *Doves Dung*, I dare appeal to the *Learned Gentleman* you have mention'd to me, whether my *Familiar Similitude* taken out of a *Scripture History*, or your *Allegorizing* on it, doth most deserve his abhorrence.

II. We are now come to your *Second Enquiry*, Whether we have not added to our *Sin of Separation*, by setting up opposite Churches, and Officers, or joyning with them? Which (you say) may admit of no great Dispute, because I had told you, that if you prove our Separation to be *Causeless*, as you think (and do but think) you have done, I will say as you do. Ay, Sir, and I promise you again to be as good as my word: But indeed you must prove it after a better fashion before I can believe our Separation to be *Causeless*:

And I am fully of your mind too, that if our Separating from the External Communion of the Church of *England* be our Sin, the setting up Opposite Churches and Officers, and joyning with them, is an adding to the Sin. But still it lies on you to prove the *Causelessness* of our so doing; which you have hitherto done by *Presumption*, and not by any *Argument* that gives us the least satisfaction. You tell us, that it is the *Erecting Altar against Altar*, which both by the *Ancient and Modern Writers*, is call'd a *Formal Schism*; and which, you say, is opposite to the *Welfare and very Being of the Christian Community*, and tends to the *Destruction of it*. To which I answer,

I. That the *Erecting Altar against Altar* is not always *Schismatical*. How ever the Fathers in their days condemn'd it, and as far as it was done without just cause, condemn'd it justly too. But if this be always, and in it self a *Formal Schism*, then must

you

you damn all the Reformers of the Church that have ever been necessitated so to do, for a Company of Schismatics.

2. The setting up, or forming by mutual agreement, of Distinct Ecclesiastical Bodies, independent on any others, as to their different Forms of Outward Worship and Communion, as far as there is a Reason and Necessity for their so doing, is no Schismatical Opposition, nor Destructive of the Welfare, much less of the Being of the Christian Community, whether by it you mean the Catholick, or any Particular National, or Diocesan Church, or Christian Community; unless you can prove that a Uniformity in the External Modes and Forms of Worship, or Government, be of the Essence and Being of a Christian Church, or absolutely Necessary to its Welfare. Indeed if some Men will raise Contentions and Persecutions on the account of these things, which hath been the Practice of many in the Church of *England*, ever since the Protestant Reformation was first establish'd, they may disturb the Peace, tho' not destroy the Being of the Church. If Men could but Master their own Passions, and suffer their Honest Neighbours to live peaceably and safely by them, I cannot imagine what it is that should threaten the *Ruin* you seem to be so afraid of. 'Tis not the Difference of External Rites and Ceremonies, but the Division of Affections and Interests, that Kingdoms, Cities, Houses, and Churches, are brought to Desolation by.

3. Neither have I forgotten what you say I granted you, *That our Separate Churches were not set up in Opposition to yours*; but by a *Necessity*, which you have brought upon us. 'Tis true, Our Churches are Opposite to yours in a Logical sense, but not in a Moral sense. They were not set up on a Principle of Opposition, which were Morally Evil, but of such necessity as made it our Duty; and

whatever the Effects of it be, as to your selves, and of which you complain, you must thank your selves for.

4. You would take it very heinously to hear your Church of *England* call'd *Egypt* and *Babylon*, out of which the true Church is call'd on to depart. But pray bear you Witness for me, that I do not call it so. But yet I must tell you too, that that Call that warrants and commands our coming out of *Babylon*, gives no allowance of an Accommodation with it, or to come out of it at halves; but makes it our Duty to depart from whatsoever of *Babylon* is yet found in the Church of *England*; And if we cannot obtain your leave to depart from it, without departing from you, which to our Sorrow we find to be our case, we must depart, at least so far from both. And this hath been the Bone of Contention between us for now more than these Six-score years.

5. 'Tis wearisome to hear you always harping on one and the same String, while you so upbraidingly ask us, *When you did communicate with us, did you thereby Sin against your own Souls, and hazard your Eternal All?*

No, you did only as you say, discharge your Duty. Hath any New thing then been since impos'd? Hath any new Law been enacted, requiring you to damn your selves, &c. Nothing of this is pretended. Is it now become Unlawful for you to communicate with us upon Occasion, especially when it is to gain an Office in the State? No, that is by no means to be granted. Doth an Office then furnish you with an Indulgence for the Commission of Sin? Doth it give you a License to work wickedness? No, no, but an Office, we must know, is of that Vertue, that it turns Idolatry into acts of Piety, Defilements into Purity, and Dung into wholesome and delightful Food; it transforms *Babylon* into *Jerusalem*, and makes breaking the Commandments to be keeping

keeping of them; These are wonderful feats, you say, and hardly exceeded by the Miracles of Transubstantiation. This indeed is a sort of Language that would sound very sharply in the Mouth of a foolish Scolding Woman, but how little doth it favour of an Academical Education, the Argument whereof is nothing else than Banter and Fallacy? Is there no other Circumstance, do you think, but that of a New Law, that will alter the Case, and make that which was once *Lawful* to become *Unlawful*, & *vice versa*? Was it because of a new Law, or any new Imposition, that *Paul* refus'd to conform to the Jewish Ceremonies and Traditions when he became a *Christian*, as he did when a *Pharisee*? Or at *Antioch*, and elsewhere, as he did at *Jerusalem*? Was that old Distinction of *Absolute* & *Secundum quid* never heard of, or never allow'd in the University in which you were bred? Did we indeed profess to believe, that to conform to the *Church of England*, as we have once done, were *absolutely Sinful*, then may you justly play at this rate upon us, if ever we Communicate any more with you: For that which is absolutely and in it self Sinful, will be always and under all Circumstances so. But after the same rate may I not Enquire of you, Was the Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance a sound and wholesome, yea a Necessary Doctrine, with which your Pulpits rang every where, while you had the Liberty to persecute us under King *Charles II.* How then became it so dangerous a Tenet under his Brother *James II.* and now since the danger you were in is over, that it should begin to recover its Orthodoxy again. This it seems was a Doctrine calculated for us, and not for your selves. Was it not once damn'd as an Act of the highest and most unnatural Rebellion, for Subjects to take up Arms against their King, to call in a Forreign Aid, and to Dethrone him, as in the Days of your

Royal Martyr? How then came this to be Sanctify'd into a Lawful and Laudable Act of Loyalty, and Publick Piety, and Necessary Self-Defence? If Circumstances do not alter Cases as to their *Lawfulness*, or *Unlawfulness*, how can these things be reconcil'd? But I shall let these your little *Deliria* pass, in hope of a more sober Reasoning in your next and more Material Enquiry. Which is this,

III. *Whether the Pastors we have chosen, have a Lawful Call to the Ministry?* And I am glad that we are at

length come to the Main Point, on which the whole Controversy turns. Wherefore laying aside your little Reflections on this Occasion, we'll consider,

1. How you have deliver'd the *Foreign Protestant Churches*, which I thought must, by your general Censure, have fallen into the same Condemnation with us. But it seems you have some Mercy for them, tho' you have but little for us; but 'tis well they are Foreigners to you, and a little out of your reach, or else they must have far'd as we do, as some of the poor *Refugees*, that have adhered to their Principles, have tasted. The way you have to bring them off, is by an *Extraordinary Call*, which you are contented to grant them to the

Page 66. Pastoral Office; but whether you are in Earnest, or in Jest, is uncertain.

For you declare, that you do not here dispute, *whether the Foreign Ministers, who were without Episcopal Government, had a just Title to the Pastoral Office*; but all the Question (as far as you care to be concern'd in it) is *concerning their own Sentiments of the manner of their Advancement to it*; and so by standing Neuter, and leaving them to defend themselves as well as they can, you cunningly think to keep your self pretty safe, as you say, *from the Horns of my Dilemma*. But I suppose you will find it necessary to declare for one side, or the other,

or you will not be so pretty safe as you think your self. But First, we will examine what the Defence is that you say they make for Themselves; and whether you have made a true Report of their Sentiments.

Now you say there are but Two ways in the Church of advancing Persons to the Sacred Function. The one is by Succession to those that were possessed of it before, which is continued by Ordination, and Laying on of the Hands of such Pastors, who were invested with Authority to that purpose; And this hath been the Ordinary way in all the Churches upon the face of the Earth. The other way is by an Extraordinary Call, which was immediately from God Himself, without the Ordinary Ministry of Man. And on This the Reformers of whom we have been speaking, you say, founded their Title to the Pastoral Office. For this you cite Beza, in whose Judgment, you tell us, that those Blessed Servants had an Extraordinary Call; and that this Call was a Divine Afflatus, which did constitute them Pastors, without any Ordination by Pastoral Hands; On which account (that you may so rid your own hands of them, and save your self from the Horns of my Dilemma) you are content to advance them into that high Degree of Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists. Now, Sir, here you must expect to meet with another of these Horned Arguments; and in this Form. Either you do indeed believe that they had this Extraordinary Immediate Call and Commission from Heaven, whereby they were truly made Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists, and thereby Authorized to introduce a New way to the Ministry; or you do not believe it. One or the other of these Two contradictory Propositions must be true; Either you do believe it, or you do not. *Utrum horum.*

1. If you do indeed believe it, that is, in the Sense, wherein you pretend to understand their Sentiments

Sentiment of their Extraordinary and Immediate Call and Commission from Heaven, then

1. I hope you will for ever hereafter maintain a due Reverence for this later sort of *Apostles*, and for their *Way*; and that the Apostle *Calvin*, and his Apostolical Churches of *Geneva*, &c. will now be deliver'd from all the Contempt that hath been cast upon them.

2. If these Men had now, on the Reformation of the Churches from the Degeneracy of that of *Rome*, an Apostolical Commission from Heaven for their Presbyterial Way and Constitution, then they are the *Episcopal Churches* only, that are the *Dissenters* and the *Schismatics*, in not conforming to the *New Apostolical Institutions*; For if you grant them an *Apostleship* by an immediate Commission from Heaven, you must also grant them a *Catholick Jurisdiction and Power* over all the Christian Churches in the World, unless you can very substantially prove that their Divine Commission, was by their Patent limited to Themselves, or to such or such particular parts of the Church, and what the Churches were that were excepted.

3. If Heaven thus constituted these Men *Apostles*, on the account of the Reformation, and by the Call to come out of *Babylon*, why were not the Scotch Reformers, and the *English* too, as much *Apostles* as they of *Germany*, *Holland* or *France*, being equally concern'd both in the Reformation, and in the Call of it? And so doubtless they were, only with this difference, Those of the *Presbyterial Way* were as *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and the rest of the Apostles and Evangelists of the Gentiles; and those of the *Episcopal Way* were as the Apostles of the Circumcision, that in compliance with the People, and the Church out of which they issued, kept up the Superstitious Rites and Ceremonies which should have been laid aside. Now Sir, either you do in truth believe all this, or else

2. You

2. You do not believe it. And if so, then have you dealt very unsincerely with them, and instead of Defending, or Excusing, you have but Mock'd them, which is a little more unchristian and ungentle, than to have left them to their own defence, and never have pretended to have advocated a Cause which in heart you condemn. And so you had been as good you had yielded silently to the *Horn* of my first *Dilemma*, as to be caught again upon this. For either you have justified the *Calvinists* by a *Divine Call* and *Apostolical Commission*; and what then will become of your own Church, let the plain and necessary consequence say; or else, as I told you in my former *Letter*, you throw us altogether into the same Pit of Condemnation for *Schismatics*.

But now that I may, if possible, set you a little righter, as to their own true Sentiments of the *Extraordinary Call* they pretend to, and that *Afflatus* by which they were acted in it, I must of necessity produce their own Interpretations, unless you will pretend to know their Minds better than themselves.

As for Monsieur *Turretin*, whom I quoted in my first *Letter* to you, it seems he is a *Man* (compar'd with you) whose *Sense* doth not signify very much, tho' by all the rest of the Protestant Learned World, he be deservedly valued for a Person of General Learning, and of extraordinary clearness and Acumen in Controversial Divinity: And he seems truly to have stated what was *Beza's* Sense of the *Extraordinary Call*, when he says, *Datur vocatio quædam, &c.* 'There is a

*Turret. Theol.
Elench. Vol. 3.
p. 241.*

"Call, which tho' it be Ordinary in respect
"of the Function it self, and of the
"Election and Ordination to it, which may be done by
"Men according to the received Order; yet may be said
"to be Extraordinary in respect of the ex imicus, and
"singular Gifts wherewith those that are call'd to the
"Office

" Office are extraordinarily endued, and in respect of
 " the wonderful Success and extraordinary Effects per-
 " form'd by them; and this was the Call of our First
 " Reformers. So that the Extraordinariness of their
 Call, imply'd no new way of Accession to the Office,
 but that Spirit of Wisdom, Faith, Patience, Zeal and
 Self-denial, wherewith they were Divinely and Ex-
 traordinarily influenced in their Reformation, as I
 told you in my Letter, p. 36. So Voet in his Vin-

Voet. Desp.
 Caus. Papal.
 p. 307.

dication of the Reformers, as to their
 Call, against Jansenius the Papist, who
 makes much the same Objection against
 the Reformers, as you do against us;
 To whom he thus replies, "*Confundis perpetuo usum,*
 "*seu Exercitium Ministerii cum Vocatione ad Mini-*
 "*sterium.* You always confound their Exercise of the
 " Ministry with their Call to it. Their Call to the
 Office was the Ordinary Call, but their Call to the
 Exercise, in some respects, Extraordinary. And
 that Beza's Sense of their Extraordinary Call was no
 other, is consequentially plain, because he always
 held the Ordination by Presbyters to be valid, and
 the Ordinary Scripture way to the Office, and pleads
 against Saravia, that the Bishop and the Presbyter
 is the same Office. But is it Beza's Sense, as you
 represent it, that this Extraordinary *Afflatus* only
 takes place where the Ordinary Call is not to be
 had, *Ubi nullus est Legitimæ Vocationis usus?* What
 can he here mean by the *Legitima Vocatio*, which
 he opposes to his *Afflatus*? Is it not either that
 Ordinary way of Calling to the Ministry, which had
 been used and legitimated by the Laws of the Church
 of Rome, from which they were now call'd to de-
 part, and not that way which this *Afflatus* directed
 them to, unless you can suppose him to illegitimate
 their own Fundamental Rule of their Reformation?
 Or else rather the *Legitima Vocatio*, is that Call
 which is agreeable to the Law and Rule of the Holy
 Scriptures

Scriptures, but had not been of a long time used in that degenerate Church of *Rome*, and unto which the Divine *Afflatus* now directed them to return? And that this is his very Sense, would appear to every one that can but construe so many of the easiest Latin words, *Ibi demum sit ei locus, ubi nullus est legitimæ Vocationis usus.* i. e. Where the Regular Scripture way of Ordination is rejected and refused, as it had been by the Church of *Rome*, there is a Call from Heaven to reform these Abuses, and to restore the Church to its first Institutions, which by their own Practices appears to be, in their Judgments, the Presbyterial, and not the Episcopal, which was the Popish Way. And thus *Beza* agrees very well both with himself, and with us; and he seems to add these last words only as a Caution against the *Anabaptists*, and other *Enthusiasts* and *Schismatics* of his Days, that denied the great Ordinance of the Ministry, and Ordination by the hands of Men, fallily pretending to a like *Afflatus*, where a Lawful and Scriptural Ordination may be had. And now, Sir, in some of your cooler Intervals, you may sit down and consider how far you have found your account from the *Acute and Learned Beza*, as you call him on this occasion.

Again, as to your Citation of *Calvin*, in an Epistle of his to the King of *Poland*, where all that you quote of him is this, "The Office that the Lord hath conferr'd on as is Extraordinary. His own words are these, " *Atque omnino Extraordinarium fuit hoc munus, quod Dominus nobis injunxit, dum opera nostra ad colligendas Ecclesias usus est.* That the Work which God had enjoyn'd and given them to do, was very Extraordinary, while he was pleased to make use of their labour to gather his Churches, and to recover them from the abominable Defection of the Church of *Rome*. The Sense whereof can be stretch'd no higher

higher than this, That their Office, the *Munus*, or Charge of the Office, was *Extraordinary*, in that their Call to it (tho' not immediately from Heaven, but from Scripture) was so very different from that *Use* and *Manner* which had so long obtain'd in the Church of *Rome*, as I had told you before from *Monfieur Turretin*, and to which *Calvin's* following words seem to agree, "*Qui ergo ita præter spem in solito modo repente apparuerunt sinceræ Pietatis Vindices, eorum Vocatio a communi Regula estimari non debet.*" Therefore the Call of those, who beyond the hope of Man in an unusual manner so suddenly appear'd to vindicate the sincere Religion, ought not to be estimated by the Common Rule, i. e. the Rule then in common use; their Work being not properly to Plant, but to Cleanse and Replant upon the Original Bottom, what was by the length of Time, and the Corruptions of Men, grown so intolerably Irregular and Offensive. This was an Extraordinary Work, not only as that which was Rare, and not to be done every Year, nor every

Pajon. Exam.
p. 234.

Age, as *Monfieur Pajon* says, but on the account of the Difficulty of the Work, and the Extraordinary Gifts and Divine Assistances that are necessary to carry on such an Undertaking. Therefore adds *Calvin*, "*Talibus enim, qui Ecclesiam ab Antichristi defectione reducerent, opus fuit.*" There was need of such Men, who in some respects resembled the Apostles and Evangelists, to reduce the Church from the Antichristian Defection. And of the External Formality of whose Call to the Ministry there was, in Extraordinary cases, no absolute need; but a Call from the People or from the Prince (so that the Persons were duly qualified with Ministerial Gifts) was in a present Exigence sufficient. And therefore he goes on in that Epistle, to encourage the King to set up such Faithful Pastors over his People by his own Authority.

rity. "*Quicquid de hereditario sacerdotii jure garrat*
"Papalis Cleris, i. e. Whatever the Popish Clergy prate
"of an Hereditary Right, or Succession to the Priesthood.
 And answers the Objection of *Remedium Violentum*,
 that this would be judg'd too violent a Remedy for
 the King to create Pastors by his sole Authority.
"Esset tamen (says he) hoc temporale munus quan-
"tisper res incompositæ manent & suspensæ. That this
"would serve as a Temporary Office, as long as things
"continued in the Interim of an unsettled
"State. Therefore where you observ'd, *Vindic. p. 66.*
 that there have been but these Two
 ways of advancing Persons to the Sacred Function, The
 one by Succession to those that were possessed of it
 before, which indeed hath been the Ordinary Way;
 Instead of the other, which, you say, is by an Extra-
 ordinary Call immediately from God Himself, and
 which, you say, but have not yet prov'd, was the
 Foundation of these Foreigners Title to their Pastoral
 Office; you should rather have made this your other,
 and Extraordinary way, viz. The Call from the People,
 as in cases of necessity they did, and where theordi-
 nary Call is not to be had, which hath sometimes
 been the case, as it was of *Fruentius*
 and his Brother *Edesius*, when they first *Sacrat. Hist.*
 began to preach the Gospel to the *Indians*; and we find in Scripture, that *C. XV. L. 1.*
Micha himself, in a case of necessity, *Judges 19.*
 consecrated first his own Son, and afterward (which
 was a little more proper) the *Levite*, to be his *Priest*.
 But to say that it was by a Divine *Affatus*, without
 any Ordination by Men that had Authority to or-
 dain, whether in the Ordinary or Extraordinary
 Case, that these Foreign Reformers receiv'd their
 Pastoral Offices, is but a Fiction of your own, and not
Beza's Words or Sense.

And yet, should I grant you the Sense that you
 would so unreasonably impose on *Beza's* Words,
 how

how little will it relieve the Impertinency of your Argument. The Question is, Whether Men may be true Ministers, or Pastors of the Church of Christ, without Episcopal Ordination? Which you deny. Now what tho' *Beza* should have said, that the Call of their first Reformers was Extraordinary? You your self have observ'd from *Beza*, that this *Extraordinary Call* is not to be allow'd of in Constituted Churches; but the Reformed Foreign Churches are now Constituted Churches, and have their Pastors by *Presbyterial* and not *Episcopal Ordination*; Are they then true Churches in this their Constituted State, or are they not? To what purpose do you tell us of the *Extraordinary Call* of their first Reformers, which was in the proper and strictest Sense true of all the Christian Churches in the World, as to their first Apostolical Planters; The Foreign Churches do not now, any of them, pretend that their Pastors are such by an *Extraordinary Call*, and *Immediate Commission from Heaven*, but that their Call to the Office is Ordinary, and their *Presbyterial Ordination* is valid; and that a *Bishop* and a *Presbyter* are not Officers specifically distinct *Jure Divino*. What have we to do then with a Call that is Extraordinary; So that the Question still stands as it was; Are they in this their Constituted State, true Churches of Christ, or are they not?

Once more, to convince you how they understand the *Extraordinariness* of their Call to the Ministry; you might have found enough to have done it, had you but candidly consulted the Author you have marginally quoted to me, the Learned and Judicious Monsieur Claude, Part 4. Chap. 4. of his *Historical Defence of the Reformation*, where he treats with a Papist, the Author of the *Prejudice*, on this Page 85. very Question, and says, "That as to the Ministry of the first Reformers, it is true, ~~that it is not Extraordinary, nor newly Instituted,~~
but

" but the same that the Apostles established at first, for
 " the Preservation and Propagation of the Church, and
 " which was preserv'd in the Latin Church down to the
 " Age of our Fathers, in respect of all that was abso-
 " lutely Essential to it, and which shall also subsist unto
 " the end of the World. We may say notwithstanding,
 " that the Reformation, in which they were employ'd,
 " was an Extraordinary Function of their Office, in-as-
 " much as their Flocks had an Extraordinary need of
 " their help; As a Vessel that is ready to be Shipwrack'd
 " has an extraordinary need of the assistance of those that
 " steer it, to avoid that entire Destruction wherewith it
 " is threatned. And then it may be called Extraordi-
 " nary, on the account of the Extraordinary Change
 " which the Reformation made for the better in the
 " Church. But as for that which regards their Call, it
 " was not Extraordinary, if by that Term they mean, it
 " should have come immediately from God, as that of
 " Moses and the ancient Prophets; or immediately
 " from Jesus Christ, as that of the Apostles; but it was
 " Ordinary, that is to say, they receiv'd it from God,
 " mediately by the means of Men. It is also certain,
 " that the Manner of their receiving their Call, as to
 " the greater part, was the very same with that that is
 " most common and usual in the Church, which is, that
 " they received their Ordination from the hand of those
 " Pastors who were themselves in that Office. And
 " much more he there says to the same purpose, which
 " is too large for me to transcribe; And acknow-
 " ledges that there were some few who receiv'd their
 " Call immediately from the Churches hand, i. e. the
 " Body of the Faithful People, " And of

" those (says he) we may say their Call Page 87.

" was Extraordinary, in the Sense that we
 " call Unusual things Extraordinary, which tho' it be Not
 " Unlawful, as he had prov'd before, yet ought not to be
 " the common Practice, but only in cases of absolute
 " Necessity: But as for those Ministers who succeeded

" them, and who receiv'd their Ordination from the
 " hands of the First Reformers, their Call was without
 " doubt Ordinary, and conformable to the Practice of
 " the Ancient Church: And all that it can have of
 " Extraordinary, consists in this, that they have not
 " followed the Papists in the Distinction of Bishops and
 " Presbyters. And it is, says he, the Presbytery, not
 " the Bishop, that gives the Ordination. And seeing
 you argue on this Head, against me at the same rate
 as that Popish Author of the *Prejudices* did against
 Monsieur Claude, I shall refer you to his Answers,
 and save the labour of transcribing him any farther.

And since you demand the same thing of
 Page 63. us, as the Chief Priests once did of our
 Saviour, *Matt. 21. 23. By what Authority*
dost thou these things? and who gave thee this Authority?
 I shall answer you as our Lord then answered them,
 by another Question, *The Foreign Protestant Refor-*
mation, whence was it? From Heaven, or of Men?
 If they may be believ'd, when they tell you what
 their own Sense of it hath always been, you have
 heard what that is; and that the Patent you re-
 quire a sight of, is no other than what is the indis-
 putable and indispensable Duty of every Christian,
 according to his Place and Station in the Church,
viz. To endeavour the Reformation of the Cor-
ruptions of the Church to which they particularly
belong, or so far to depart from it, which is ac-
ording to the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles,
who have bid us beware of the Leaven of the Pharisees
and of the Sadduces, Matt. 16. 6. When he putteth
forth his own Sheep, he goeth before them, and the Sheep
follow him; for they know his Voice. And a Stranger
will they not follow, but will flee from him; for they
know not the voice of Strangers, John 10. 4, 5. Take
heed what you hear, Mark 4. 24. Prove all things, hold
fast that which is good, 1 Thess. 5. 21. Stand fast in
the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be
 not

not intangl'd again with the yoke of bondage, Gal. 3. 1. Little Children keep your selves from Idols, 1 Joh. 2. 21. Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God, because false Prophets are gone out into the World, Ch. 4. 1. Yea, and why even of your selves judge ye not what is right, Luk. 12. 57. From such Scriptures as these we take our Commission and Authority, not to *dethrone Kings*, or to *new model the Civil Governments of the World*, no, nor to *depose Bishops* or *overthrow their Chairs*, or to *abrogate their Office*, which you pretend to fear, but to pull down, at least as far as concerns our own Practice, the *High Places* and the *Strong holds of Antichrist*, and not to be partakers of other Mens Sins, but to keep our selves pure, and to avoid those Corruptions of Worship which some Men would impose upon us. And this is not only agreeable to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, but to the Doctrine of the Church of England too, as, were it needful, I could sufficiently prove by all the Arguments that have been us'd to justify their Reformation, and Departure from the Church of Rome. And by this time I hope you have reason to see that that piece of Railery, as you just call it, and with which you fill'd one half of your 71st Page, endeavouring to fasten it on me, is but your Invention, and might better have been omitted. And thus I shall for the present take leave of my Foreign Protestant Brethren, that I may the more closely attend to what you are pleas'd to charge Us with, who are nearer at home with you.

2. The Next thing that we are to consider, is What concerns but some, and that a very few of us, viz. Only such of us as have had Episcopal Ordination; Of which number perhaps you will hardly find Three in a County now alive. And your great quarrel at these is, That since they must have solemnly promis'd that they would obey their Ordinary, you were,

were, and are still desirous it should be consider'd, how the Blessing of Heaven can be expected on their Work, as now it is manag'd, when it is a continual breach of that Engagement. To which I reply'd in my Letter, as you have rightly enough quoted it, That our Charity obliges us to believe, that they took the Oath of Canonical Obedience in no larger Sense, than is consistent with the Rules of the Gospel; and I further added, that we are sure it is no otherwise binding to 'em. And of this Opinion I am still, and so I think are all the Protestant Calvinists that ever wrote of the Obligation of an Oath. Yet this is what you are pleas'd to call *Perjury*; I suppose, not because you would quarrel at my general Solution of the Case, wherein you would be very singular; but either because you would persuade us, that to Swear a Blind and Unlimited Obedience to a Bishop, is the Duty of all that expect License to preach the Gospel under him; Or to believe, that whatsoever the Bishop is pleas'd to Command, is both Lawful and Honest, and agreeable to the Rules of the Gospel, which is your continued way of Begging the Question, taking that for granted, which we utterly deny. So that all your Rhetorick on this your unprov'd Supposition, doth but expose your self.

But as for those that have been Episcopally Ordain'd, and yet now act in a State of Non-conformity to the *Church of England*; How will you be able to prove that these Men did not take that Oath, or Subscribe their Obedience, with some Overt Protestation, that none of these their Oaths, or Subscriptions, should Oblige them to do any thing contrary to the Word of God, that is, what in their own Consciences they were perswaded to be the Word and Will of God, as several did, and were permitted to do in Queen *Elizabeth's* time; and if so, how uncharitably have you censur'd them for *Perjury*?

Perjury? But whether it were so, or no; Let me ask you Seriously, Are you a Protestant, and dare you affirm that an Oath of Canonical Obedience, impos'd by a Bishop on any Priest, or Presbyter, is in the full latitude of the Words of the Oath, and of the Sense and Intent of the Imposer, Obligatory on the Conscience of him that Swears, so that he may not at any time, nor in any case, without Sin, do or forbear any thing besides, or contrary to the common and obvious Sense of his Oath? Or doth an Oath of this kind always certainly deliver a Person from the danger of Sinning against God in keeping it? Doth the Authority of a Bishop so sanctify the matter, as if he were a God? Pray consider whither it is that such a Position as this is leading you; Or of what Protestant did you ever learn this Doctrine? 'Tis true, Oaths are Sacred things, and not to be prevaricated or mock'd with, but must be Sworn in *Truth*, in *Judgment*, and in *Righteousness*. Therefore whoever meddles with an Oath had need to be first well advis'd both of the *Matter* of the Oath, and of the *Intent* of the Imposer, that his Oath do not afterward give him just cause of Repentance, or prove a *Vinculum Iniquitatis*. But you will tell us, that the Things here Sworn to, were in themselves *Lawful* and *Honest*, and by vertue of the Episcopal Command, much more by the Oath, are made *Necessary*. Ay, Sir, this is but what you have all along told us; and I have told you too, for what Reasons we believe the contrary, and must so believe, till you can better convince us that we are in an Error; For what Church is there in the World, that will not, in their own case, tell us just as you do?

I shall dismiss this your little Cavil *Hist. Des.*
with the words of *Monfieur Claude*. *Ref. Part. 4.*
"I acknowledge (says he, speaking of *Ch. 4. p. 86.*
their First Reformers) "that in their Admini-
stration

"stration they went beyond the Intention of those
 "who had conferr'd the Offices on them, but they
 "did no more in that than they ought; For the Mini-
 "stry which they had receiv'd being God's, and the
 "Churches, and not those private Mens who commu-
 "nicated it, they were bound to refer theirs to the great-
 "est Glory of God, and the Edification of his Church,
 "and not to the Will and Interests of the Court of
 "Rome, and its Prelates, altho' it was thro' their
 "Channel that they receiv'd it. They did well there-
 "fore to make use of that which they had of Good in
 "their Call, and to purify that which was Bad in it:
 "And they also did well to make use of it against the ill
 "Intention of those who had given it them for an ill
 "End. Even as those who have receiv'd Baptism from
 "a Heretical or Schismatical Society, are bound by
 "that same Baptism which they have received from
 "them, to oppose themselves, as much as possible they
 "can, to that Heresy or Schism, and to make use of
 "that very Baptism for it, altho' it should be against
 "the Intention of those who gave it to them. And
 thus to deal with what is Evil in an Imposition, tho'
 bound on by an Oath, is not meerly matter of Li-
 berty, but matter of Duty. And if to pluck the
 Foot out of the Snare, be to put a Trick upon a Bishop,
 as you suggest, 'tis but an honest Trick for a Trick;
 and how ever you may hope to Cozen Children
 with these your Toys of Argument, we will beware
 that you cozen not us Men with your Oaths of Ca-
 nonical Obedience.

But before I pass on to the Next Head, I will
 propose this one Query; Whence it came to pass
 that on the Protestant Reformation, some of the
 Churches, as the *Lutheran* and *English*, retain'd the
 Episcopal Government, as it had been practiced in
 the Church of *Rome*, and by the abuse of which the
 Bishop of that See had mounted himself to his An-
 tichristian height; But the other Churches, as those
 of

of *France, Scotland, Holland, Geneva, &c.* Establish'd themselves on a *Presbyterial* Polity, or Form of Church-Government? If I conclude right, the reason of this diversity was this, Those Churches who had, at least some, Bishops to head the Reformation, and the Civil Government to countenance it, whose Creatures and Counsellors the Bishops had for a long time been, and whose Grandeur might be suppos'd to strengthen the Cause, and to carry it on with the more ease and honour, these held their ancient *Episcopal Constitution* still; But those other Churches, which were the greater number, who had none but Presbyters, that is, Pastors of particular Congregations, and who were, in the true Sense both of the Scriptures, and of the Primitive Times, Bishops as well as the other, tho' not Diocesans, these proceeded no higher in the Polity of their Reformation than their own Order, nor indeed could they do otherwise: Not but that they had the same Power, as any of the Ancient and more Primitive Churches had, by mutual consent and agreement, to have elected one among themselves, and to have constituted him in a higher Degree of Episcopal Order and Prehendency over the rest; but as there was no necessity for it, so neither would the Times and Circumstances of these Churches then bear it; For 'twas the common and invincible Opinion of these Churches, that it was impossible to be rid of *Popery*, the yoke under which they had so long groan'd, unless they were rid of *Prelacy* too, which was the first and main Political step by which the *Roman Antichrist* had obtain'd his usurped Throne in the World. So that it was but by this happy Accident, that the Church of *England* came to be *Episcopal*, having first a good King, and afterward a good Queen, and with them a few of the Bishops to lay its Foundation, who would be sure not to degrade themselves, nor to renounce that, of which all

Mankind are naturally so fond, for the sake of a *Reformation*; and which perhaps they might hope would, by this means, be manag'd with the greater advantage. So that the Difference that is between the Protestant *Prelacy* and *Presbytery*, was, in its Original, but accidental, and on the *Presbytery's* side of necessity, as Mr. *Hooker* himself grants in his *Preface to his Ecclesiastical Polity*, Page 5. On this account I take the Case and Call of these Foreign Churches to the Reformation to be Extraordinary, that is, not only in respect of their Qualifications for the Work, but in respect of the Necessity they were under of Establishing their Reformation without Bishops, had they been ever so well satisfy'd of the Lawfulness or Expediency of a Clerical Prelacy, or Episcopacy, which was never, by any of the Orthodox, held to be Essential to a Church, nor ever Established by Apostolical Constitution, but only by Post-apostolical Ecclesiastical Canon, but is but Humane, and of no obligation in cases of Necessity. And was not this our very Case too here in *England*, in the *Inter regnum*, when there were none but Presbyters to Ordain? And so it continues to be our Case ever since, while Episcopal Ordination cannot be obtain'd, but on such Conditions as we cannot with the Peace of our Consciences submit to. Nay, did we indeed believe (as perhaps some do) that Episcopacy were so far *Jure Divino*, as being that Form of Church-Government which is most agreeable to the Pattern given us in the New, as well as Old Testament; yet Government it self being not of the Essence of the Church, neither this nor that Form of Government can be pleaded against the Law of Necessity; nor oblige any one to Sin against his own Conscience in Submitting to it, as it sometimes happens when Sinful or doubtful Conditions are requir'd. So then our Call to the Ministry is in this respect as Extraordinary, as was that of the Foreign Churches.

3. Having

3. Having thus dismiss'd those few that were *Episcopally Ordain'd*, you will now bring us a little closer to the Business, and consider *those Teachers, which, you say, are our own in a* Page 73. *more peculiar manner, as being ordain'd by Presbyters, or by such as are so reputed, [for the Title of Presbyter, it seems, is what you can hardly afford 'em, tho' you do so commonly, with Scorn enough, call them Presbyterians] and their case, as you say, being new, and also disturbing the Order that was established over the World, nothing can support it, nothing should be offer'd for its Defence, but what is clear Demonstration.* Thus runs your first Paragraph. But by the way, if that which you here call *New* appear to be Senior to, or but co-equal with that of *Episcopacy*, which you plead for, I hope you will have no reason to charge it as a *Novelty*, or to call it *New*. And as for that Order which you say this doth disturb, you should first have prov'd when, and by whom that Order was establish'd over the World, before you had so confidently asserted it, and that by as clear Demonstration, as you challenge for the Contrary, or else you do but presume and hector, and not argue like a Scholar. But that you may carry the point by force of Noise, and not of Argument, you lift up the same cry against us, as the Rabble did against Paul and Silas at *Thessalonica*, *Acts 17. 6. Those that have turn'd the World upside down, are come hither also.* You would have the World believe that we pretend to be set over *Nations, and over Kingdoms, and to all what the Prophet Jeremy was but sent to foretell, Jer. 1. 10. to root out and to pull down, to build and to plant.* How full of Bug-bears hath your Jealousy fill'd your Head? There were then in great fear, where no fear was, *Psal 53. 5. Who is it that is going about to destroy you, or your Government? Is it as Death to you to let us live in Peace among you?*

you; Is it the want of your former Prey that makes you thus to roar against us? Can't you satisfy your Hunger but with our Blood, but fancy you shall be destroy'd unless you destroy us? What have we ever done to raise those Jealousies in your Minds? Or is it the Phantome of Forty eight that doth so disquiet you? The true and impartial History of that Time would certify you, what the real Cause and Occasion was, and who both the Seen and the Unseen Authors of these Tragedies were, to the full and eternal Vindication of the Innocency of those whom you call *Presbyterians*, as to that Matter of which they have been so invidiously and falsely accus'd by some. And since these unhappy days, for these Fifty years past, what Plots or Conspiracies have you convicted us of? Have we not patiently enough born all the Severities and Barbarities that have been practiced upon us; Where lies the Danger you seem to be so apprehensive of? Have you not all the Security that the Civil Government can Lawfully or Reasonably give you, for the Establishment of your Church in all that Legally appertains to it? Are you not safe enough in all your Ecclesiastical and Civil Rights, Dignities and Properties? Who is about to molest you? Will that Moderation of Spirit, and Christian Charity, and Bearing with your Dissenting Protestant Brethren, in the things which your selves call Indifferent, will the Practice of Love and mutual Forbearance, which Christ and his Apostles require of you, destroy you? If you will not your selves be reform'd according to the Pattern of the Holy Scriptures, will your suffering others to reform themselves, as they are able, in a more Private Capacity, and in the most Peaceable manner, destroy and overthrow your Church?

And whereas you tell us, that *Yours is a sort of Government, which hath been transmitted down to us from*

from the Apostles, throughout all succeeding Ages, and was established in all Christian Nations; but that Ours is another, that was unknown to Antiquity, and for above a Thousand years after Christ was not receiv'd by any Church in the World. This is a high Rant of words, and soon spoken; but than which nothing can be more untrue.

The Question is, Whether *Episcopacy*, and that as it is now established and practiced in *England*, is that Form of Church-Government, which hath been transmitted down from the Apostles throughout all succeeding Ages, and was established in all Christian Nations? This is what you, with great confidence affirm; and We on as high a Presumption of Authority and Reason do deny. But

1. This being a Matter of Fact, the main proof of it depends on the Authority of Ecclesiastical History, and the Judgment of the Orthodox upon the Case. But here we find

1. That there are none of the most Learned, Judicious and Inquisitive Doctors, even of your own Church, that dare affirm *Episcopacy*, much less your *Episcopacy*, to be *Jure Divino*, or Apostolical. Bishop *Stillingsfleet* denies that our Lord and Saviour hath determined any one Form of Government for his Church, by any universally binding Act or Law of his. And answers all the Arguments that are brought to prove it. Mr. *Hooker* is

Irenic. Par. 2. p. 176, &c.

of the same Opinion, who says, "He which affirmeth Speech to be necessary amongst all Men throughout the World, doth not thereby import, that all Men must necessarily speak one kind of Language. Even so the necessity of Polity and Regiment in all Churches may be held, without holding any one certain Form to be necessary in them all. And that this hath been the concurrent Opinion of the greatest Men of your
own

Ecc. Pol. 1. 2. Sect. 2. p. 131.

own Church, holding Episcopacy to be only *Secundario* Divine, I need not tell you, but may rather challenge you to produce those that have ever made any Figure in your Church, that have been of another Opinion.

2. To grant the Specificall Identity of the Office of Bishop and Presbyter at and from the Beginning, is to deny the Episcopacy you contend for to be Apostolical. Your *Episcopate*, according to your *Hypothesis*, is an Order and Office specifically distinct from the *Presbyterate*. Now I say, From the Beginning it was not so, *Ergo falleris*. My Assumption I prove thus, If they were from the beginning specifically one and the same Office and Order, then were they not specifically distinct, but from the beginning they were specifically One and the same, as appears both from Scripture, and from the Concessions of your own Church. From Scripture, *Tit. 1. 5, 6, 7* I left thee in Crete, (says Paul to Titus) that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and Ordain *πρεσβυτερος* Presbyters in every City, and such as were blameless, *οτι γαρ τον επισκοπον ανειρηνητον ειναι*, for a Bishop must be blameless. Pray how many distinct Offices doth the Apostle here make of the Presbyter and the Bishop? Are they not both one and the same, which if you will call *Episcopate* from his last word, we will on the same ground call *Presbyterate* from his first word, *Acts 20. 17*. When Paul was at *Miletus*, he thence sent to *Ephesus*, and call'd *πρεσβυτερος* the Elders, or Presbyters of the Church; and taking his leave of them, gave them a strict Charge to take heed to themselves, and to the Flock (not the Flocks) over ~~the~~ which the Holy Ghost had made them *επισκοπους*, Overseers or Bishops, *v. 28*. What are the Bishops then more than Presbyters, or the Presbyters less than Bishops? *1 Tim. 3*. Where the Apostle gave Instructions concerning all the Church-Officers then in being, do we find any more,

more, or any other mention'd, besides these Two, Bishops and Deacons? And at Philippi were there any more than Bishops and Deacons? Phil. 1. 11. or, which is the same, Presbyters and Deacons. Therefore Saravia, who is reputed the most Learned and Rational Defender of *Defens.p.286.*

Prelacy, acknowledges, *Episcoporum omnium & Presbyterorum unum esse Ordinem constituo.* I maintain (says he) that the Order of all Bishops and Presbyters is but one. And, *Ministerii Evangelici unitas probatur ab eorum unitate, & ut ita loquar, identitate.* The Unity of the Gospel-Ministry is prov'd from the Unity, and I may say, the Identity of these.

And this is taken from an indisputable *Postulatum*, not only by all the Foreign Protestant Churches, but by all the most Learned and Moderate of the Church of England. So says Willet,

"Tho' a difference be necessary, yet this
"cannot be prov'd by the Word of God;
"and in the Apostles times, a Bishop and
"Presbyter were neither in Name nor Office distinguished.

*Willet. Synop.
Pap. Con. 5.
Q. 3. Part 2.*

Mr. Hooker himself thus Expounds and Comments on *Hierom*, as holding Episcopacy (that is, in the later Sense and Use of it) alterable, "The Church

*Hook. Eccles.
Pol. 17.p.12.*

(saith he) "bath Power, by universal Consent, upon
"urgent cause, to take it way, if thereunto she be constrain'd, through the Proud, Tyrannical and Unreformable Dealings of her Bishops. Therefore, lest
"Bishops forget themselves, as if none on Earth had
"Authority to touch their States; let them continually
"bear in mind, that it is rather the force of Custom,
"than any such true Heavenly Law that can be shew'd;
"by the Evidence whereof, it of a truth appears, that
"the Lord himself hath appointed Presbyters for ever,
"to be under the Regiment of Bishops, in what sort soever they behave themselves. Let this Consideration
"be a Bridle to them; let it teach them not to disdain

"the

“the Advice of their Presbyters, but to use their Authority with so much the greater Humility and Moderation, as a Sword which the Church hath power to take from them. But if Men have power to take their Authority from them (and which hath in several Churches been justly done) then is it certain that they received it not from God, but from Men. To these I might add, the Suffrage of all your other Doctors that have written on this Case, of which many speak as fully and expressly to our Purpose, as we our selves can do or desire; as Archbishop *Usher*, Bishop *Jewell*, Bishop *Davenant*, Bishop *Bedell*, Bishop *Stillingfleet*, Dr. *Morton*.

2. That the present English Episcopacy was not that sort of Government that was transmitted down to us from the Apostles, and established in all Christian Churches, as you have affirm'd, is so evident to all that know any thing of the Primitive Constitution of the Churches, that I presume there are few, besides your self, that can have the Forehead to assert it, nor can it ever pass for true, unless your Charity may be allowed to unchristian all the Churches in the World, that are not fully of your English Constitution. But that the Diocesan Episcopacy is essential to a true Church of Christ, as that without it there are no true Ministers, nor Ordinances, is a Doctrine that was never receiv'd in the Church of *England* before Archbishop *Laud's* time, who was wont to say, *Ecclesia Romana, Turba Genevensis*. But that there was no Diocesan Church in actual Existence in the whole Christian World, for more than the first Three hundred Years, is undeniable; because there was no Episcopal Church, that had then more than one *Altar* and one *Baptistry*, and therefore was but one Pastoral Charge or Congregation. May not every Parish now in *England*, that hath its own proper One *Altar*, and one *Baptistry*, be as truly call'd a Diocese, as the
Bishops

Bishops One *Altar* of Old was? But when many Altars were erected under the Jurisdiction of one Bishop, then, and not till then, was it properly called *Diocesan*, and agreeable to your *English* Constitution, which was a Form unknown to the Primitive Churches. Particularly that of the Church of *Ephesus* was undeniably of a *Presbyterial* Constitution, as appears from *Acts* 20. 17, 28. where the Apostle gives his charge to all the Presbyters of that Church in common, *To take heed to the Flock* (that is, that particular Flock) *over which the Holy Ghost had made them Bishops or Overseers*; not one over all the rest, nor one more than another, but all equally Bishops of one and the same Office, and with a parity of Power and Authority in the same Church. And so we have reason to believe, that all the other Churches of the Apostles planting were constituted, until you have prov'd the contrary. And this was the Original Doctrine, Practice and Constitution, of the *Waldensian* Churches, which by their Enemies Confessions, hath been diffus'd throughout all the Christian Churches; and deduc'd from the Apostles times, tho' it had no occasion to appear in them, in a distinguishing manner, till the Innovations and Usurpations of a *Lordly Prelacy* began to appear, and to lift up it self in the Churches, against which these were some of the first and chiefest *Witnesses*. Nor ever was there any one particular Church of Christ, since the days of the Apostles, that understood what a *Diocesan* of your *English* Form and Constitution meant, till the Anti-christian Spirit of Pride and Tyranny began to exalt it self in the *Roman Pontif*; But after that, indeed, it obtain'd, by the Favour of the Empire, in some Churches sooner, and in others later. But to say that this was that sort of Government that was transmitted down from the Apostles, and establish'd in all Christian Churches, is a sort of Confidence

dence that out-faces the clearest Evidence of all Church-History and Antiquity, as hath been already so abundantly prov'd by many others, that it would be superfluous for me, to repeat any more of their known and undeniable Testimonies.

4. That there was an Episcopacy in the Churches in and from the Apostles days, and of Apostolical Institution, I readily grant. But then there is a Threefold Episcopacy, a sort of Bishops: As,

1. The *Episcopus Pastor*. And of this sort every *Presbyter*, lawfully ordain'd to the Ministerial Office, is a *Bishop*, at least potentially, or *actu primo*; and every *Presbyter*, to whom is committed *Cura Animarum* in a distinct Pastoral Charge, is actually, or *actu secundo* so; that is, a *Bishop* to that Flock to which he is a Pastor. Of the first sort were all those *Expectant Presbyters* in the Primitive Churches, under the chief *Pastor-Presbyter* or *Bishop* of the Church, in which was but one Altar, tho' several Inferior *Presbyters*. They were *Bishops Elect*, in as much as the Office was legally conferr'd on them, tho' they could not in that State regularly act, but in submission to, and by the direction of, the chief *Presbyter*, or *Pastor* of the Church, unto whom they serv'd only as Ministerial Assistants, Chaplains, or Curates, and as his *Common Council* in Matters of Government. And on this account it was, that the *Bishops* of these Primitive Churches made such Declamations against the Schisms that were Causelessly and Illegally rais'd by any of their *Presbyters* against them, as any *Pastor* would now do, that hath several Chappels of Ease under his Pastoral charge, but can't govern his young Chaplains or Curates in their respective Chappelries, to which he hath assign'd them. Of the second sort were those that were then call'd the *Bishops*, in contradistinction to their *Inferior Presbyters*, and had the chief Pastoral care of the Flock, and the supream Power over it,

as every Minister of a Parish now hath, or ought to have, over his Chaplains or Assistants, whether they be more or fewer. And this sort of Bishop is granted to be of Divine and Apostolical Institution.

2. The *Episcopus Præses*, who, as a Presbyter, is not Superior to any one of the Inferior Presbyters, because the Inferiority cannot consist in any difference that is in the *Order*, or *Office* it self, which admits not of *Magis & Minus*, but in a *Degree*, which for Clerical Discipline and Government sake, is conferr'd on some for the sake of others. And this sort of Episcopacy is not Pastoral, because every Presbyter-Pastor hath the entire and sole Power over his own Altar, or Flock. But what is properly call'd *Episcopal*, according to the Primitive Acceptation and Use of the Distinction, reaches indeed to the Persons of the Presbyters, or Pastors of several Altars, as many as are within his Episcopal Bounds or Diocess, but not to any of their Altars or Pastoral Charges; because one Pastor may legally be Pastor to no more than one Flock at one time, not only because it is a kind of Spiritual *Polygamy* in the Relation, but because it is inconsistent with the Ends of his Pastorship: So that he that is Bishop in this sense, is Pastor only to his own Congregation, or Pastoral Charge, but Bishop, or Superintendent, to his whole Clergy, who, with his Collegues, or Common Council of the Senior Presbyters, is set for the Administration of the necessary Clerical Discipline, and to see that the Presbyters do, in their respective Pastoral Charges, discharge their Duties according to the Rules of the Gospel, for the Edification of their particular Flocks, and the Preservation of the Unity and Peace of the whole Church; And wherein they have Power given them to Admonish, Suspend or Deprive, according to the Merit of the cause. And this Episcopacy is

G

generally

Spanb. Hist.
S. 1. p. 154.

generally held to be but *Humane*, or at most but *Secundarily Divine*, by most of the Learned both of the Presbyterian and Episcopal Perswasion. As for my own Thoughts of it, I am not concern'd here to declare, because it is not that which is like to solve the Controversie between us. For whether this is of *Divine* or *Humane* Institution, this is not the Episcopacy you are contending for.

3. The *Episcopus Princeps*, whose Will must be a Law to all the Presbyters that are within his Diocess, chosen and settled as Pastors to their respective Flocks and Congregations, within their Parochial Bounds and Limits, as tho' they were but his own Domestick Chaplains; that claims a Pastoral Jurisdiction over all the Flocks within his Diocess, tho' never so large, and impossible to come under his Pastoral Administration, and without whom all the necessary Acts of Pastoral Discipline may not be administer'd by every particular lawful Pastor, within his own Parochial Bounds and Congregation. This is what hath been long ago justly condemn'd for *Antichristian* and *Diabolical*, and contrary not only to the Practice of the Primitive Churches, but to the Law both of Christ and his Apostles, *Matt. 20. 25, 26. 1 Pet. 5. 3.*

Hence you proceed to make one *Essay* more of your great Skill at interpreting that controverted Text, *1 Tim. 4. 14. Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* And here, as if the Fate of the Question did depend on the private Opinion of one single *Calvin*, you endeavour to represent him as either against us, or at least as at a loss in it; and in order to this, you undertake to translate a few lines of his *Latin* in his *Institutions*, the place you cited in your *Discourse of Schism*, p. 96. and to which I answer'd in my Letter, p. 38. But
with

with that Answer it seems you are not pleas'd, but ridicule it after your huffing manner, as a *Wriggle* and a *Shuffle*, and pretend now to give us *Calvin's* Sense on that Text more fully. But what miserable *Wriggles* and *Shuffles* you here make, will appear to every one that can but compare *Calvin* and *You* together. You say, *Calvin* starts a doubt, whether many Persons always impos'd their hands together for the Ordination of a Minister, or whether a single Person might not do the Work. *Calvin's* words are these, *Hoc postremo habendum est, non universam multitudinem manus imposuisse suis Ministris, sed solas Pastores; Quamquam incertum est an plures semper manus imposuerunt necne.* Lastly, says he, this is certain, that the whole Multitude were not to impose hands on their own Ministers, but Pastors only; tho' it be uncertain whether many hands were always impos'd, or no. For the former, he mentions what was done to the Deacons, and to *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and to some others: Where by the way you might have observ'd, that he speaks not a word of Bishops, but Pastors only, to whom he ascribes the Right and Power of Ordination. Whatever their Figure, as to Degree in the Church be, 'tis their Right, as Pastors or Presbyters. But, says he, *Paul* himself, in another place, relates that Himself, and not many others laid hands on *Timothy*, where he says, *I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the Gift that is in thee, by the putting on of my hands, 2 Tim. 1. 6.* And this Text, it seems, was that made *Calvin* uncertain, whether Ordination was not sometimes done by a single Person, contrary to the common Custom. *Nam quod altera Epistola de impositione manuum Presbyterii dicitur, non ita accipio, quasi Paulus de seniorum Collegio loquatur, sed hoc nomine Ordinationem ipsam intelligo, qua si diceret, fac ut gratia quam per manum impositionem recipisti, quum te Presbyterum crearem, non sit irrita.* Which you English thus, For what is

said in another Epistle of the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, I do not so understand it, as if Paul did speak of the Colledge of Presbyters, but by this word I understand the Order it self, as if he had said, take heed that the Grace which thou receivedst by the Imposition of hands when I made thee a Presbyter, be not in vain. Now upon this little Exercise of yours, you must give me leave, tho' perhaps you may think it a little rude,

1. To ask you, by what *Dictionary* you learn'd to construe these few *Latin* words of Calvin? Where did you find that *Ordinationem ipsam* did signify the Order it self, and was the same as *ipsam Ordinem*? Of which, the One signifies the Office, and the Persons by whom, which is according to your own Translation; the Other the *Action* with the Office and End, for which the hands were impos'd, which was plainly Calvin's sense, as his last words there do explain him. Sir, this was a gross mistake of the *Agents* for the *Action*.

2. But let it go for the Order, as you have translated it, and then you must read it thus, *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Order of Presbyters*; and had you not been as good to have said, the Colledge of Presbyters? For by the Order I hope you must mean the *Persons* in that Order, unless you will take the Order and the Office in the Metaphysical abstract Sense, and then by what Magick you will fasten these Hands to it, that they may be impos'd in Ordination, I confess I am not Artist enough to understand. So now you say as I do, It was by the hands of the Presbyters that Timothy was Ordain'd a Presbyter.

3. How ever Calvin did suppose that Timothy might be Ordain'd, whether by One only, and him an Apostle, or by many, wherein he seems to be uncertain, and would not be positive one way or other, yet

yet in this he was clear, that it was by the *Presbytery*, or *Presbyterial* Authority, whether of one or more, that *Timothy* was Ordain'd, and that not an *Apostle*, nor an *Evangelist*, nor a *Bishop*, (i. e. in your sense) but a *Presbyter*.

4. The Exposition which I gave you of *Calvin's* sense in this Place, which you have cited of him, seems still to me most genuine, and agreeable to the Scope and plain words of his discourse; That the *Apostle* in his Second Epistle did not design to mind *Timothy* so much of the *Manner*, or *Instrument*, or *Ceremony* of his Ordination; as of the *Sacredness*, and *Ends* of that holy Office that was confer'd upon him, that he might not receive that Grace of God in vain.

5. We cannot rationally nor soberly suppose, that the *Apostle Paul* did, in his Second Epistle to *Timothy*, contradict what he had said in his First, but having affirm'd in his First Epistle, that when he was Ordain'd, it was by the hands of the *Presbytery*, he would not say in his Second, that it was done by his hands alone, unless in conjunction with the *Presbytery*, nor could he, by the *Presbytery*, which is a Noun of Multitude, mean only his own single Person, for tho' *Paul* was a *Presbyter* he was not a *Presbytery*; Therefore the most probable and general Opinion is, that *Paul* was personally present, and President in that *Presbytery*, or Assembly of the *Presbyters*, when *Timothy* was first Ordain'd to the Office of a *Presbyter*.

6. But that which to me seems most probable and proper to reconcile these Two Texts, is this, It is evident that the *Apostle Paul* wrote these Two Epistles to *Timothy*, not as to a *Common Presbyter*, or Minister of the Gospel, but as to his *Colleague*, his *Deputy*, or *Apostolical Nuncio*, if I may so say, to the Churches which *Paul* had planted, for the settling and confirming them by the *Apostles* Directi-

on and Authority, and so to supply his Presence with them ; on which account he was called an *Evangelist*, as *Barnabas*, and *Silas*, and *Titus*, and many others were, who were the Apostles Companions, and subordinate Delegates in the Apostleship. And these, tho' they were *Presbyters*, by their Common Office, yet as they stood thus related to the Apostles, and acted by Immediate Apostolical Commission, on all occasions when and where the Apostles sent or appointed them, they were more than Ordinary *Bishops* or *Presbyters*, and were of the Apostles own chusing and Ordination. And to this Office it seems to be, that *Paul* mentions the Imposition of his own hands only, when he Ordain'd *Timothy* to the Office of an *Evangelist*, and wherein indeed it doth not seem proper that any other less than an Apostles should joyn with him, without an Express from Heaven for it. Every one having the Liberty and Privilege of chusing his own Servants and Assistants in the Office committed to him, by a Natural Right, where it is not limited and predetermined by a Superior Power. Now this is not properly nor truly an Ordination to the general Office, but presupposes that, and is only an Assignment to some Particular Post in the Office. And this appears to me to be the whole Business of that Ordination of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *Acts* 13. beginning, *The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them*; which was to go and Preach the Gospel to the *Gentiles*. Now this could not be their First Ordination to the Office of the Ministry, because they had both been some years in that Office before. *Barnabas* is said to be one of the *Seventy*, whom Christ himself had sent forth to Preach his Gospel before his Passion, and *Saul* had his Commission immediately from Christ at the time of his first Conversion, when

when he was taken up into the *Third Heavens*, Gal. 1. 1. 2 Cor. 12. 2, 3, 4. Yet for this Particular work they were ordered to pass under all the Ceremonies of the most Solemn Ordination, as *Fasting and Prayer, and Imposition of hands*, and that by such as were in Office before them: Which, tho' perhaps some Men have overlook'd, and mistaken this for their first Original Ordination, yet doth it not invalidate the Argument drawn from that Text for *Presbyterial Ordination*, but rather proves it *a Majori*; For if such an Ordination was then requir'd to distribute Officers to their Particular Posts, and which I think should be drawn into precedent in like Cases, much more is a Solemn Ordination, by the hands of such as are in the same Office, necessary to constitute Persons in the Office it self.

But then after all the Use that you have made of Calvin, you say, you have not laid any weight on Calvin's *Exposition* (as indeed you might well perceive that according to your Comment on him, it would bear no great weight, and therefore it had been as good you had let him alone.) But supposing (as you have all the reason in the world to suppose) that by the *Presbytery* we are to understand the Persons that did bear the Office, yet, you say, you are not certain from the Expression it self, who are intended by it, (and why so?) for it is a Name of Dignity, and sometimes attributed to Ecclesiastical Officers of the highest Rank, as to St. John and St. Peter, who were Apostles as well as Presbyters. And now, you say, the Question (that is of your own starting) is, whether the Supream or Inferior Presbyters Ordain'd Timothy; that is (say you) whether they did it who had power to Ordain him, or they who, as far as we can find, never had such Authority? If you state the Question thus, Whether they did it who had power to do it, or they that had none? It will be readily answer'd to your content. But how pittifully do
 G 4 you

you beg the Question still ? To talk of a Supream and an Inferiour Order of *Presbyters*, is but your Dream, and unprov'd *Hypothesis*. 'Tis true, *John*, and *Peter*, and *Paul*, and all the rest of the *Apostles*, were *Presbyters*, but then they were something more besides *Presbyters*, and which was not at all included in that Office. To be an *Apostle*, or an *Evangelist* was not a higher Degree of *Presbyters*, but Offices wholly distinct from it, as well as Superiour to it. Consider'd meerly as *Presbyters*, they stood on a level with all other *Presbyters* ; but the Ordination was done by *Presbyters* as such, therefore whoever they were that Ordain'd *Timothy* a *Presbyter*, or whatever their Extraordinary Additional Offices were, 'twas by vertue of their *Presbytership* that they made him a *Presbyter* ; But he that made him an *Evangelist*, which is but a Relative Subordinate Office, assistent to an *Apostle*, as that of the *Deacon* is to the *Presbyter*, must be something more than a meer *Presbyter*, because of the dependance it hath on a Superiour Office. But for *Presbyters* to Ordain *Presbyters*, is as Natural and proper, as for Men to beget Men, or any other *Species* of Creatures to beget their like. But if it must be an *Apostle*, or some Extraordinary Thing above a *Presbyter*, that must Ordain a *Presbyter*, then is the Gospel-Ministry extinct with the *Apostles*, and those Extraordinary Persons of the First Age

of the Church ; Unless you can prove a distinct Superiour Office to that of *Presbyters* convey'd down from and by the *Apostles* to all the Succeeding Ages, and that these are the only Men that have the Power of Ordination ; and that too, not by vertue of their *Presbytership*, but by vertue of that Office of Jurisdiction wherein they are Superiour to *Presbyters* ; And so you will make the *Presbyter* but as a kind of poor *Mushroom*,

See a Letter of
A. B. Usher,
published by Dr.
Bernard, p. 4.

or some anomalous Plant, that hath not Seed in it self to propagate or preserve its own kind.

When I offer'd to prove that it is the *Presbyter*, not the *Bishop* (consider'd only as such) that must Ordain, because a Bishop or Prelate Ordain'd *per Saltum* (i. e. who never had the Ordination of a *Presbyter* himself, but only of a Bishop, and of which there are Instances enough in *Popish* Countries) can neither consecrate nor Administer the Sacraments, nor Ordain a *Presbyter*, and told you this was a *Rul'd Case*, you very insultingly demand, *Where was this Case Rul'd ? Or in what Record of Antiquity is it to be found ?* As if common Practice and Custom, founded on the Nature of the thing, were not sufficient to Rule the Case, without a Written Law Enroll'd and Recorded for the Instruction of Posterity, in so doubtful a Matter. Yea, will not the Common Doctrine, Practice, and Rubrick of your own Church amount to the Force of a Rule in this Case ?

But still, you say, the Question is, *Whether* p. 78. *the Power of Ordination was committed to meer Presbyter ? And this being a thing of the greatest moment, and our whole Cause depending upon it, it might have been expected, you say, that we should have produced some strong and clear Evidence for it from the Holy Scripture ; but that was not to be had. To which I again reply,*

1. That what I have already said, both in my First Letter, and in this Second, is Evidence sufficient to any unprejudic'd Judge. But,

2. If you expect express words from the Holy Scripture for it, you may as well call it an *Impious Presumption* to Baptize Infants, or to keep the First, and not the Seventh day of the Week for the Christian Sabbath ; besides many other things which you allow and practice as Sacred ; and

3. What

3. What strong and clear Evidence have you from the Holy Scripture, that Ordination belongs only to the Bishop, or where are these express words to be found, and when you have found it, we will as clearly prove it from the same Scripture to belong to the Presbyter, because the Bishop and the Presbyter are, in the Holy Scripture, one and the self-same thing, as hath been already undeniably prov'd.

4. As for what I demanded of you, *Letter p. 46.* to prove that either *Simeon*, who was called *Niger*, or *Lucius* of *Cyrene*, or *Manaen*, who were commanded from Heaven to ordain *Paul* and *Barnabas* (such as that Ordination was) were any of them at that time more than mere Presbyters, as to matter of Office; you tell me, *That they were Prophets, and what they then did, was by the Command of the Holy Ghost.* To this I answer,

1. That *Prophet* is an ambiguous word, and signifies not only to Predict, or Foretell, but to Preach the word, and so is the same with a *Preaching Presbyter*. *Prophetare* *Ravanel. Bib. Sac.* *dicatur pro Scripturas interpretari, sive ex Extraordinaria Spiritus S. revelatione sive ex Facultate, acquisita studio ac meditatione, quod Doctorum, Officium est in Ecclesia, Matt. 7. 22. 1 Cor. 11. 4. Chap. 13. 9. Chap. 14. 24. Rom. 12. 6. 1 Thess. 5. 20. 2 Pet. 1. 19. Rev. 10. 11. Chap. 11. 3.*

In all which places the *Prophet* is no more than the Ordinary Preacher of the Gospel; and why it must not be so taken here, *Acts 13. 1.* you ought to have given us some Strong and Clean Proof, before you had so confidently huff'd it, especially while the same Persons are call'd *Prophets and Teachers*, which words seem to be Synonymous or Enegetical. But,

2. Let them be *Prophets* in the Sense as you would have them, what are you like to get by that? The Spirit of Prophecy indeed was one of the Extraordinary Gifts of these Times, which were wont to

to be given by the Imposition of the Hands of the Apostles (which I think was that *χάρισμα τῷ Θεῷ*, *Gift of God*, which was in *Timothy* by the putting on of *Paul's* hands, when he only chose him for his Collegue in the Apostleship, and which he exhorted him to stir up, *2 Tim. 1. 6.*) and was but a Gift and not an Office, and given not only to such as were in Office, but to others also, therefore this was not that which could give them the Power of Ordination; but Ordainers must be Men in the same Office, and therefore it is here expressly said, they were *διδασκαλαί*, *Teachers or Preachers* by Office, which is the same as to have call'd them *Presbyters*. Ministers of the Gospel they were, whatever were their other Extraordinary Qualifications, and as such they had power to ordain, and to conveigh the Office, tho' not the Extraordinary Gifts, to any others, as there should be occasion: And hereunto they were now particularly call'd by the *Holy Ghost*, which was here mention'd not to shew the Extraordinariness of the Action, there being nothing Extraordinary in it, but of the Occasion, and that the Mission of the Gospel to the Gentiles by the hands of the Apostles *Paul* and *Barnabas* his Collegues, was from the Lord, to obviate the Offence which the Jews would be ready to take at it: So that, as far as they may be allow'd for an Instance of Ordination, which had all the usual Ceremonies and Formalities that were due to the most Solemn Ordination, here you have Ordination given by the hands of such as were of no higher an Office than *Presbyters*, and that by an immediate Order and Authority from Heaven.

I should here proceed to the Testimonies from Antiquity, and the Practice of the Primitive Churches, but that I suppose you will expect it as *Good Manners* for me to follow, and not to lead; and therefore must first attend you on another little
 Diversion

Diversion you have made on a Question that I had proposed *Letter p. 46.* Whether there be any Rule or Precedent in the New Testament for Ordination by a single Person, our Lord Jesus Christ Himself alone excepted? which I held in the Negative, because we find all the Ordinations mention'd in Scripture, perform'd by the hands of more than One, in Conjunction, as that of *Timothy* by the hands of the *Presbytery*, *1 Tim. 4. 14.* which I hope now stands sufficiently vindicated against all your Cavils; and that of *Barnabas* and *Saul* by the hands of *Simeon*, *Lucius* and *Manaen*; and that of the *Deacons* by the hands of the *Apostles*, *Acts 6. 6.* Accordingly we observe, that whither soever any of the Apostles went out to gather and plant the Churches in the World, they never went single, but took their Companions, one or more, always with them, till they had settled in every Church a standing *Presbytery* of their own. And what were these Companions of the Apostles taken for, but to act in Conjunction with them in all things that concern'd their Churches, both as to Doctrine, and the Settlement of them in a Political Order and Government? And whereas I demanded any one Instance of an Ordination celebrated by the hand of any one single Person, whether Bishop, Evangelist, or Apostle, you now tell me of *Timothy* and *Titus*, the first of whom *Paul* left to ordain Elders, and to settle Affairs in the Church of *Ephesus*, and the other in *Crete*. And to put the matter, as you think, beyond dispute, you tell us, *That Timothy was not a Multitude, nor Titus a College. Neither had the One or the other, as you are bold to say, any Associates joyn'd in Commission with them for the Works of Ordination.* To this I reply,

1. That what I demanded, was an Instance of an Ordination perform'd by a single Hand; But instead

stead of that, you produce certain Rules, sent by the Apostle to single Persons about the right management of Ordination, which is very wide from the Question. You should have prov'd When, and Where, and Whom, either *Timothy*, or *Titus*, did ordain any one, in these, or in any other Churches, by their own single hands, without the Assistance of any others, but it seems we must take it for granted upon your bare word, and that because the Apostles Direction was sent particularly to these Men, who were his more immediate Delegates in these Churches, and therefore none else were more than passively concern'd in it; for you can dream of no Government in the Church, less than *Monarchical* and *Absolute*, tho' it be but the *Executive* part of Government.

2. That *Timothy* and *Titus* were the chief Rulers under the Apostle in those Churches for the time of their residing there, I know you will not deny. And if so, then they were virtually and relatively, tho' not personally, more than single Persons, the whole *Presbyteries* of these Churches being included in them; so that tho' the Epistles, and all the Rules contain'd in them, were directed to them personally, as the Apostles Deputies there, yet all the other Officers were joyn'tly and equally concern'd in them, and what was spoken personally, must be taken and practiced collectively, as is common in the Administration of all other Governments in the World, and because else the Apostle's Rule would not consist with the Apostle's Practice, who never did confer Ecclesiastical Orders by a single hand, but in conjunction with his Companions, whom he always took with him in his Travels to this end. So that *Paul's* directing his Orders to single Persons, doth not prove that they must be executed by single hands.

3. Whether

3. Whereas you say, that *neither had the One, or the other, any Associates joyn'd in Commission with them for the Work of Ordination*: This is *gratis dictum*, yea, and contrary to the Truth. 'Tis true, if you mean in Commission with them as *Paul's Legates or Deputies*, to act in his Name, and by vertue of his Apostolical Authority, as the *Evangelists* of these Churches, who had by Derivation, and Deputation, the same Authority in them; in the Apostle's absence, as the Apostle himself had, I will grant they had none joyn'd in that Commission with them; but as for all the Ordinary Work of the Ministry, and Administration of Government and Ordination, they had with them a *Presbytery*, or *College of Presbyters*, first ordain'd by *Paul* and his Companion, and so left in *Presbyterial Commission* with those his Deputies and Officers Extraordinary, who were to Ordain others, according as the future State of the Church should require: So that in *Ephesus* there was *Timothy* and his *Presbyters*, and in *Crete Titus* and his *Presbyters*, in equal Commission with them; as to all the Ordinary Work and Offices of the Ministry; tho' these *Evangelists*, during the times of their residence, were Presidents in those Churches, for the better ordering and securing of all things upon the Apostolical Foundation. And if after these *Evangelists*, a *Presidency* was preserv'd among the *Presbyters*, by preferring the most worthy *Presbyter* to a higher *Degree*, for the securing of the Peace and Order of the Church, this could not be done by any Positive Rule we find the Apostles left for it, but as the Nature and Ends of Government necessarily require, and by mutual consent and free Choice and Election; nor when they had so done, could it possibly amount to the Dignity or Office of an *Evangelist*, which must have a special Consignation from the *Apostles* own hand; but it must be a Creature of their own setting up, and consequently
might

might in case of Heresie or Male-administration, be by the same hands taken down again.

4. We are now come to examine your Pretensions from *Antiquity*; But here I Page 89. find very little more than Noise and Railery. What you cite out of *Jerom*, *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret* and *Ambrose*, is as little as one can imagine to your purpose. From what I have already said, a sufficient Answer may be drawn to all the Inferences you have made from what you find in *Antiquity*. But being now on the Spot with you, I shall spend yet a little more time on it. And because you seem to run on *Sub ignorantione Elenchi*, as if you did not understand wherein the Controversie between us lies, I shall once more repeat the *Question* in the true State and Sense of it, at least as far as I own it, or pretend to defend it. The *Question* in short is, *Whether Presbyterian Ordination be valid, according to the Practice of the Primitive Churches?* Which I Affirm, and you deny. I prove it

1. From the Primitive Identity of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*. In the *Primo-Primitive* State of the Church, the *Bishop* and the *Presbyter* were one and the same Office, without any Note of Distinction of Superiority, or Inferiority between them, as hath been already prov'd, both from Scripture, and from the Writings of the Fathers of these Times, and acknowledg'd by so many of the most Learned and Orthodox of all the succeeding Ages; and if so, then what the *Bishop* did, the *Presbyter* did, & vice versa. Among whom the Learned Archbishop *Usher* acknowledges, *Vid. plura Mr. Baxt. Treatise of Episc. Ch. 25. p. 223, &c.*
Quod in Primo-Primitiva Ecclesia Commune erat Officium Episcoporum & Sacerdotum, & Nomina erant communia, & Officium commune; Sed in Secunda-Primitiva ceperunt distinguere & Nomina & Officia. That in the First Primitive Church, both the Name and the Office of Bishop and

and Priest, or Presbyter, were the same, but afterward both Names and Offices began to be distinguished.

2. I prove it from the Practice of the Primitive Churches, both before and after the Distinction was made between Bishop and Presbyter. Before the Distinction was made, it can with no colour of Reason be deny'd: And afterward, when to prevent Schism, (as it was hoped) and for the more Uniform and Stricter Management of Church-Government, this Distinction (tho' not of Office, but of Degree) began to be made, they were the Presbyters that first chose and created their own Bishops; and who in Conjunction with the Bishop, when and where he was resident, ordain'd their Presbyters too, as *Jerom* in his Epistle to *Evagrius* tells us, that the Presbyters of *Alexandria*, from the days of *Mark the Evangelist*, till *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*, made and ordain'd their own Bishops, and these chosen from among themselves. But here you would fain deny that the Presbyters did so much as Elect, much less place this their Elected Presbyter in his higher Degree, or Episcopal Seat, which is the same with Ordaining, or Consecrating him Bishop, because *Jerom* doth not speak it expressly, tho' you confess 'tis probable he meant so, and so indeed any one would by his words take his meaning to be; for, the Apostles and Evangelists being dead, who were there, but the Presbyters, to do it? And who so proper to do it, as the Presbyters of the same Church, over which the Bishop was to be set? And that it was really so, appears by the Difference that *Jerom* makes of the Presbyters making their own Bishops *anciently*, from that which was afterward done by *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*, which was by *Episcopal Consecration*. And as for those other words you quote of him in that same Epistle, *Quid enim facit, excepta Ordinatione, Episcopus quod Presbyter non facit?* What doth the Bishop which the Presbyter

byter may not do, except Ordination? It is evident, that he speaks this of that after-State of the Church, when this Distinction of Bishop and Presbyter was by Canon brought into it, which was not so from the Beginning; but then indeed, ordinarily, and according to the New Episcopal Canon, it was not regularly done without the Bishops Presence or Order, tho' not by Himself alone, without his Presbyter's Counsel and Concurrence. And that this was the Primitive State and Constitution of the Alexandrian Church, appears not only by Jerom's Report, but Eutychius, the Patriarch of that Church, testifies from the Ancient Records of it the same thing, as Selden translates it from the

Arabick Originals, *Constituit item Marcus* Baxt. Episc.
Evangelista duodecem Presbyteros--- adeo c. 25. p. 224.
ut cum vocaret Patriarchatus eligerent

unum e Duodecem Presbyteris, cujus Capiti reliqui Undecem manus imponent, eumque benedicent, & Patriarcham eum crearent; & de in verum aliquem, quem eligerent Presbyterum, secum constituerint loco ejus qui sic factus est Patriarcha, ut ita semper extarent Duodecem. Mark the Evangelist appointed Twelve Presbyters [in the Church of Alexandria] that when ever the Patriarchate should be void, they might chuse one of the Twelve Presbyters, on whose Head the other Eleven should lay their Hands and bless him, and create him Patriarch [i. e. Bishop or Chief Pastor of that Church] and then should chuse another, and constitute him Presbyter in his room, who was made Patriarch, that so there might be always Twelve. And thus it continued in that Church till the days of Alexander their Patriarch. How can words express it more clearly or fully, that in that Famous Church of Alexandria, both their Patriarchs, i. e. their Bishops, and their Presbyters, were anciently ordained and consecrated by their own Presbyters.

The History of Scotland informs us, that their Churches were long govern'd by meer Presbyters without Bishops, and therefore could have no Ordination but by Presbyters. *Hect. Roeth. Hist. Scot. l. 7. Johan. Major. de Gest. Scot. l. 2. c. 2. Fordon. &c.*

The same is recorded of the *Gothick Churches*, who were for Seventy Years after their Conversion without a Bishop, *i. e.* distinct from the Ordinary Presbyter, *Ulphilas* being the first of that sort. *Philostorg. Eclog. l. 2. c. 5.*

The Presbyters of Scotland came over at King *Oswald's* request, and ordained Bishops for him here in England, as *Beda* Reports. The First Protestant Reformers here in England, call'd *Lollards*, or *Wickliffists*, practiced Ordination by meer Presbyters, *Walsingh. Hist. Angl. An. 13.* Hence it appears, as *Spanheim* observes out of *Eusebius* and *Jerom*, that Episcopal Primacy was anciently *Ordinis tantum & Præsidentiae*, only a Matter of Order and Presence. *Non Imperii, non Potestatis*, not of Government or Power. *Consuetudine introductum, non Dominica dispositione paulatim primo in Majoribus Ecclesiis, deinceps Orbe toto.* Introduced by Custom, not by Christ's appointment, and growing by little and little, first in the greater Churches, and afterward all the World over. *Spanh. Hist. Secul. 2. p. 631.*

Yea in the Third Century, when Episcopacy began to lift up its head in the Church, *Non penes Episcopum solum Ecclesia sunt, sed conjunctim cum Presbyteris & Diaconis.* The Government of the Church was not in the Power of the Bishop alone, but in conjunction with the Presbyters and Deacons. And to these are given all the Titles of Government with the Bishops, and therefore call'd their *συνάρχοντες*, and *συνθεσπον*, and *συνεπισκοποι*, and *συνεπισκοποι*, and *συνεπισκοποι*, and the like, Their Collegues, their Fellow-Bishops, their Com-presbyters and Associates in Government. *Spanh. p. 789.* And tho' this Distinction

tion of Order and Degree between Bishop and Presbyter were at first intended, or at least pretended, as a Remedy against Schism, it hath since appear'd by the Churches sad Experience, thro' the abuse of it, that a greater Occasion of Schism, Ambition, and Church-Tyranny could not have been devised.

Hinc nata mox in Ecclesia Schismata Turba, ut Testis est passim in Historia sua Eusebius ex Amulatione & Ambitione Episcopatus, says Spanheim, *Abd. p. 831.* Much more might be added on this Head, but I forbear it as needless. And conclude, That for you to say that

Ours is a New Way, never approv'd in Ancient Times, and unknown to all the Churches upon Earth; and that yours is that way of Government which hath been transmitted down to us from the Apostles to all succeeding Generations, is notoriously Untrue, to say no worse of it.

3. I prove it from the Disparity that is between the Primitive Bishops, and those of the English Constitution. The Bishops of those Primitive Churches were but the Pastors of those Churches to which they were related, as undeniably appears by this, That they had but *One Altar*, or Place of Communion, and were requir'd personally to know and inspect all the Members of their Church, even to the meanest Servant, which is the proper Pastoral Work and Duty. And the Presbyters, which were not dispos'd of, and settl'd in their Pastoral Charges, with their own Distinct Altars, &c. were but as their Chaplains, their Pupils, or Menial Servants, over whom they exercis'd a Despotical Authority, and thought they had reason so to do, and therefore could not regularly, nor lawfully act in any Church-matters, but in Subserviency to their Chief Pastor, who was their *Ordinary*: But yet even then, those that were dispos'd of to their respective Charges, as in the Country Villages some were, these had the

Title and Honour of *Chorepiscopi*, and were allow'd the Power of Ordination, and of all other Acts of Discipline, within their own Bounds. But now the Bishops of the *English Constitution* were quite of another *Species*, who have not only their own proper Pastoral Charges, and their *One Altar*, but claim a power of Jurisdiction over all the Pastors and Altars within such a Province as they call a Diocess, that is, over such as were in the Primitive Churches *Bishops*, or *Chorepiscopi*, which was never pretended to in the Primitive Churches, till the *Roman Bishop* began to usurp it, and was then by all others condemn'd as *Antichristian*. So then, if the Bishops of the Primitive Churches, with the Assistance of their own Presbyters, or of their Neighbour Bishops, had power of Ordination, so have such as are Pastor-Presbyters now, with the assistance of their Neighbour-Presbyters.

4. I prove it from the Concessions of many of the most Learned and Famous of the *Church of England*, Dr. Burges, in his Book written in Defence of the Ceremonies, says, "For Bishop and Presbyter to differ
" *Specie*, and Orders to be void without a Bishop, is New
" in the Church of England. In the Book subscrib'd by both *Arch-Bishops* 1537, we find this, "The
" Truth is, that in the New Testament there is no
" mention made of any Degrees, or Distinction in
" Orders, but only of *Deacons*, and *Priests*, or *Bishops*;
" And of these Two Orders, that is, of *Priests* and
" *Deacons*, the Scripture maketh express mention. Dr. Stillingfleet, from *Cranmer's* own hand says,
" That Bishops and Priests were not Two things, but both
" one Office in the beginning of Christ's Religion. Dr.

Whitaker *Regius Professor in Cambridge*, to Page 141. *Campian's* Tenth Reason, says, "If to
" condemn Prayers for the Dead, and to
" make Bishop and Presbyter equal, be heretical, Nihil
" Catholicum esse potest, nothing can be Catholick or
" Orthodox.

" Orthodox. Mr. Hales of Eaton, in his
Treatise of Schism, says, " They do but Hales of
 " abuse themselves and others, that would Schism, p. 6.
 " persuade us, that Bishops, by Christ's In-
 " stitution, have any Superiority over other Men, further
 " than of Reverence; or that any Bishop is Superiour to
 " another, further than positive Order, agreed upon a-
 " mongst Christians, hath prescrib'd, — Nature and
 " Religion agree in this, that neither of them hath an
 " hand in this Heraldry of Secundum sub & Supra.
 " All this comes from the Composition and Agreement
 " of Men amongst themselves. Wherefore this abuse
 " of Christianity, to make it Lacquey to Ambition, is a
 " Vice for which I have no extraordinary name of Igno-
 " miny, and an ordinary I will not give it, lest you should
 " take so transcendent a Vice to be but
 trivial. Reynolds in a large Letter to Iren. Eliah.
 Sir Fr. Knolls about Bishop Bancroft's p. 18.

Assertion, that Bishops were a Superi-
 our Order to Presbyters *jure Divino*, prove the con-
 trary, and brings in Jewel, Pilkinton, Humphrys,
 Whitaker, Bradford, Lambert, and Fulk against him;
 and yet Bancroft himself would not annul the Ordina-
 tion of meer Presbyters, as Dr. Bernard and Fuller
 in his Church-History will tell you;

That in 1609, When the Scotch Bishops Judgment of the
 were to be Ordain'd by London, Eli, A. B. of Ar-
 and Bath, a Question was mov'd by magh p. 134, 135

Andrews, Bishop of Eli, whether they must not be
 first Ordain'd Presbyters, as having receiv'd no Ordi-
 nation from a Bishop. Arch-Bishop Bancroft main-
 tain'd that it was not necessary, seeing Ordination
 by Presbyters must be esteem'd valid, where Bishops
 could not be had. Bishop Usher, in his Life written
 by Dr. Parre, who gives it under the Bishops hand
 in these words, *The Power of Ordination proceedeth*
not from Jurisdiction, but from Order, but a Presbyter
hath the same Order in Specie with a Bishop, therefore a

Presbyter is equal to a Bishop in that Power. This Doctrine of Reordination was not found in the Church of England till Bp. Laud's

* And the Author of the Case of the Regale, and Pontificatus, a great Champion of the Church, is driving at the same design at this Day: But it's hoped that all wakeful Englishmen will see the Snake in the Grass. time, in whose Life Dr. Heylin * tells us, that there was design'd an Accommodation between Us, and the Church of Rome, and thinks it might have been effected, had it not been for the Jesuites abroad, and the Puritans at home. And whether there be any such Design on foot still, you have more reason to know than I. How

much more might I easily collect from your own best Authors, which before you had fallen so foully on us, you ought to have better consider'd.

But by the way you are very angry with me for mentioning the Time, when your Bishops were banish'd from the Clergy of England: And had I not reason then, according to your Principles, to enquire as I did, What then was become of the Church of God in England? And whether the way of Salvation was, for want of a Diocesan, blockt up during the Interregnum? For you plainly make your Bishops as Essential to a Christian Church, as Christ himself is, who is the Head of it. But why should the remembrance of these days so affect your ulcerated Spleen, and seem to inflame you with a Spirit of Revenge, against those that are as innocent of what was then irregularly done, as your self? Might you not have made some better use of it, in considering what the true Occasion and Ground of these Tragedies were, both Civil and Ecclesiastical; How far the Laudensian Church Party were concern'd as the Causes of it, on that side, and in whose Interest they were then engag'd and acted; and on the other side, what the Reasons of State were, for which the Sword was drawn between the King and his Parliament;

Parliament; and by whose Secret Counsels, and on what Hopes, that unnatural War was broach'd; and how very few, and next to none, there were in that *Parliament*, that were not in actual Communion with the *Church of England*, tho' many of them dissatisfy'd with some Dangerous and Arbitrary Proceedings, both in *Church and State*? Should not these things have been consider'd by you as just matter of Lamentation, and a Caution too against your inflaming Principles and Practices, and have taught you more Moderation toward such as are still accounted your Weaker Brethren? The Design of those that then influenc'd that Juncture, was to rid the World of the *Puritans*, and with them of all the *Northern Heresy*, and how far your Zeal is now embark'd in the same Design, you best know. 'Tis true, there were some, and too many, of the Factionous Spirits of those days, who, had they had their impious Wishes, there had never been a *Bishop* more in *England*, nor *Presbyter* neither. But before you had laid these heavy Charges on the Innocent, you should have consider'd, who they were that were the chief Instruments, and that acted on the sincerest Principles in the Restauration of the Banished King to his Kingdom.

In the remaining part of this *Section*, I find nothing material that hath not been, by what I have already said, sufficiently Page 86. answer'd; Only shall take a little notice of the great Offence you take at my saying, It is not true, that an Inferiour Officer may not invest one of a Superiour Order in his Office, else what have the Bishops to do in the Coronation of Kings? To this you grant, that in matters of *Human Invention*, and which are managed by *Compact and mutual Agreement*, persons may communicate to others what they had not formerly (formally, I suppose, it should be) but virtually only in themselves. By which words

you have fairly given up your Cause, unless you can maintain it against an Army both of the Fathers, and of your own Doctors, that the Diocesan *Bishop* you are pleading for, is not of *Humane Institution and Agreement*, but an unalterable Decree and Ordinance of Christ's appointment in his Church; which Decree of Heaven, when you are sure you have obtained, you will do well to communicate it to the Church; and yet then it will not hold in Extraordinary Cases.

Now tell me, That by affirming that Timothy was an *Evangelist*, and an *Extraordinary Officer*, we cut off the Succours which we would draw from this place, for the Defence of our Ordination; For (say you) according to our own Opinion, here is no Example of a *Presbyter's* constituting a *Presbyter*. Which is your great, if not willful, Mistake; For our Opinion is not, that the *Presbyters* ordain'd Timothy an *Evangelist*, or *Extraordinary Officer*: This was what the *Apostle* did, and not meer *Presbyters*; but 'twas the *Presbytery*, wherein perhaps *Paul* was concern'd as Chief, that ordain'd him a *Presbyter*. And as for the Prophecy that was mention'd in his case, this could concern only his Person, that is, his Personal Qualifications, and fitness for the Office, by which those that ordain'd him, were directed, to exert their Ordaining Power in investing him with the Office, and which might seem to be particularly needful in his case, because of his *Youth*: So that 'twas not the *Prophecy* that made him an Officer, whether Ordinary or Extraordinary, but those that had a General Power and Commission by Office so to do, and were directed by the Holy Ghost so to apply their Power in this particular case. But your concluding Timothy to be a *Bishop*, because he was an *Evangelist*, that is, that he was but an Ordinary, because he was an *Extraordinary Officer*, is the ground of your Mistake all along, and so must I take it, until

until you have prov'd, that a *Bishop* and *Evangelist* are both one, or have demonstrated the Succession of the one to the other, by some plain Apostolical Rule. So that tho' we should grant what you here affirm, viz. 1. That after Timothy's advancement from a meer Presbyter to an Evangelist, other Presbyters were subordinate to him, 2. That he was not deposed nor degraded from his Authority, but had it for Life. 3. That he did not take his Honour to himself by Usurpation. This will be of no more use to you, than if we did grant it, as we do, to the Apostle Paul himself, whose Deputy, as an Evangelist, Timothy was. And whereas you tell us, that supposing Paul in conjunction with the Presbytery, and as the chief Agent in that Action, did ordain Timothy a Presbyter, this perfectly agrees with the Practice of the Church of England, I think is another of your Mistakes.

1. Because you compare your Bishops with Paul, who was an Apostle, an Extraordinary Officer.

2. Because you suppose it necessary, that some Extraordinary Officer, superior to a Presbyter, ought to be present, and the chief Agent in the Action of Ordination, to make it valid, for which we have no Rule in the New Testament. There was no Officer in the Churches of the Apostle's founding, superior to a Presbyter, but what was Extraordinary, and but Temporary; but Extraordinaries being now ceas'd, 'tis the Presbyter alone that is chief Officer of Divine Institution.

Wherein soever your Church of England agrees with the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostolical Churches, we own it, and rejoyce in it; but to deny the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination, and to reordain the Protestants of that Way, whether Natives or Foreigners, is not according to the Practice of the Apostolical or Primitive Churches, especially while those of the Popish Orders are allow'd as valid,

valid. Tho' *Felicissimus* was ordain'd Deacon by *Novatus* one of *Cyprian's* Presbyters, and that *Schismatically*, yet he was not depos'd on the account of a void, tho' Canonically irregular, Ordination, but for his Male-administration; much less then when there is no such thing as *Schism* in the case.

As for Mr. *John Owen's* Ten Arguments, proving from Scripture and Antiquity, that Ordination by Presbyters, without Bishops, is valid, (tho' I know no more vertue in the number Ten, than you do) and which, you say, you have consider'd, and find no great weight in them, but that they are fully answer'd by a Learned Conformist Mr. *Gipps*, who hath thereby eas'd you of that trouble; I have no need to give my Opinion of the Fullness of his Answer, Mr. *Owen* himself having done enough in his Reply to it, to demonstrate to the World, how Fully and how Learnedly Mr. *Gipps* hath acquitted himself in answering any one of those his Ten Arguments. And indeed I do not wonder that you account it an Ease to be deliver'd from such a Task.

And now, Sir, Whether that which I have call'd a Rock, be only a Heap of Rubbish, as you scornfully term it? Whether I have advanced frivolous Conjectures, as you say, for evident Truths, and meer Fictions for Rul'd Cases? And how like a Rabbi, or Ecclesiastical Hero, you have defended the Province you have undertaken, I humbly submit to the Censure of more Impartial Judges.

Sect. IV.

The Contents whereof, in your own words, are, *A Review of the things that have been said in the Defence of the Separation.* And here after a Rude Preface, according to your manner, you descend to Particulars.

1. The first is, *Whether our being One with you in Matters of Christian Faith and Doctrine, will deliver us from the Guilt of Schism,*

Schism, in separating from you in some other things? That we are One with you in all the more Material Articles of the Christian Doctrine, you could not deny; but seem'd to be passionately offended that we were so near to you in Doctrine, while we could not comply with you in what you seem'd to urge, as more essentially necessary to Christian Union: Which I told you was unaccountably strange, that Communion with you should be the thing you so zealously contend for, and yet are afraid of our coming too near to you. But you now tell us, That you have as much reason to be afraid, as ever the Trojans had to be afraid of the Greeks, whom they so unadvisedly took into the City in the Belly of the Wooden Engine. Wherefore you, as a more sharp-sighted Gentleman, had rather that Schismatics, as you are always pleased to call us, should continue their Railing at a distance, than that upon pretence of being one with you, they should get over your Fences for their own advantage, and the ruin of your Constitution. I wonder what it is that makes you still so jealous-headed, and afraid of being ruin'd by us; Will a Reformation according to the Holy Scriptures undo you? Will Moderation, and bearing with your Dissenting Protestant Brethren undo you? Will Liberty in matters of Ceremony undo you? Or is it in truth the want of your Old Prey that is like to do it? Who hath hurt you in your Dignities, or your Revenues, or your Ceremonies, or any other way for these Forty Years past, that you have tryed and tempted us? Do not ruin your selves and us too, and then I do not know but that you are safe enough.

But why are you so impatient of the least touch at the Doctrines that are by some preach'd among you, as too Arminian or Romish? Was it not the Sore that made you sting so high, as to charge this Accusation, tho' never so just, with the Blood and Confusion of Three Kingdoms, and to call me Fool
and

and bear for mentioning it? And then you go on, like a Man in a Trance, first to clear your Party of the Charge of *Arminianism*, by telling us, That Persons of great Eminence had asserted the Doctrine of *Universal Redemption*; without telling who these Persons are that you mean, nor in what Sense they understand it; tho' you say, They were such as were persecuted with Banishments, and Imprisonments, and with Death it self. And as if this Doctrine of *Universal Redemption*, and that in the unsoundest Sense of it, were the only, or the main Error that is commonly branded with the name of *Arminian*. But you have no reason to expect, that I should now divert into the *Arminian* Controversies with you, which is so foreign to our present Business. And then to clear your selves from the Charge of *Romish Doctrines*, you tell us, How unreasonable and unexcusable the Charge is at this time of the day, when your Clergy in a very eminent manner, have so lately demonstrated the Falsehood of it to all the World; and by their Books and Sermons, have laid Popery in gasping Agonies before them. As if there were no *Popish Doctrines* preach'd by any of the Church of *England*, because there are some that have declar'd against them. The good and eminent Service that several of your Learned and Reverend Church-men have done, in defending any of the sound Doctrines of the Reformation, against the Church of *Rome*, we acknowledge with Thanks both to God and to them. But,

1. These are not the only Men that have appear'd both in *Pulpit* and *Press*, against the Errors and Idolatries of that Church, tho' these indeed have had the fairest Publick Advantages to do it.

2. Tho' many of the Orthodox Doctrines of the Reformation, have been strenuously and zealously defended by some; yet this doth not prove, that there are no Articles of Doctrine commonly taught in

in the Church of *England*, that savour too much of the Degeneracy of that Apostate Church, but which I shall not now particularly mention, lest you upbraid me again with bringing new Questions into the Controversie.

Whatever the Conformists (some few of them, you should have said) have to their eternal honour done, in opposing the most violent Attempts of Popery: In whose Politick Interest very many of the inferior Clergy are justly suspected to be, is known to all that observe any thing of Publick Motions and Measures.

But when you so unjustly, and falsely, upbraid us once and again, with the *Cordials* that were administer'd to it by other P. 103, 104, &c. hands, who to their eternal Confusion did offer up their Incense to it, and with the most servile Offices were labouring to support it. This shews us but the Rancor of your own Spleen, and how fretting an Acid your Spirit of Charity is become. This is your *disipation*, and so pleasant a Diversion to you, to chew it over and over, that you can't have done with it. To which I have already reply'd, and shall now only tell you, how ill it doth become you, to accuse those of a Bad Design, who did but give thanks to an Enemy for delivering them out of the hands of their cruel Oppressors and Persecutors. And as for that Stuff you have gather'd, as you say, out of certain Letters from French Protestant Refugees in Germany, which I confess I have not yet seen, I might answer you with the Judgment of the Foreign Divines both from Geneva and several other parts, sent in Letters to the Bishops of the Church of England in Queen Elizabeth's time, where they gave their Judgment on the matters in Controversie between us, and declare, "They could hardly suspect, that those of the Church of England should be guilty of things so clear besides all Office of Bishops; And

- Judgm. of For.* " And particularly as for Ministering
Divines, p. 4. " Vestments, If Surplice, Corner-Cap
 " and Tippet, have been Badges of Ido-
Ibid. p. 14. " laters in the very act of their Idolatry,
 " What have the Preachers of Christian
 " Liberty, and the open Rebukers of all
 " Superstition, to do with the Dregs of the Romish
 " Beast? And therefore (speaking to
Ibid. p. 15. those that then complain'd of these
 things) " we think, said they, that ye
 " should boldly oppone your selves to all Power that will,
 " or dare, extol it self, not only against God, but to the
 " burdening of the Consciences of the Faithful, further
 " than God hath burdened them by his
Ibid. p. 30. " own word. In the Liturgy of England,
 says Calvin, " I see there were many
 " tolerable foolish things; by these words I mean, that
 " there was not the Purity which was to be desir'd. These
 " Vices, tho' they could not at the first day be amended,
 " it was lawful to begin with such Rudiments, but so,
 " that it behoved the Learned, Grave and Godly Mini-
 " sters of Christ to enterprize farther, and to set forth
 " something more filed from Rust, and purer — I can-
 " not tell what they mean, which so greatly delight in the
 " Leavings of Popish Dregs. And that the Fo-
 reign Ministers of greatest Note are of the same
 Judgment still, I shall only add what Monsieur
 Claude has in a Letter to the Bishop of London (as
 'tis thought) " I am perswaded (says he) you will not
 " take it amiss if I tell you, that you ought on your part
 " to contribute to the Union of the Church, without look-
 " ing to any side. All that which Sweetness, and Cha-
 " rity, and Condescension, and Prudence, require of you,
 " that you may have nothing to accuse you before God;
 " and that you may draw his Blessing upon you. There
 " is a Complaint, that my Lords the Bishops are very
 " Zealous to prosecute Men by Penal Laws, as if they
 " were Enemies. There is a Complaint, that your Go-
 vernment

"vernment over the Ministers, is just the same with
 "that of the Bishops of the Church of Rome. There
 "is a Complaint, that you will give Orders to none,
 "but to those that will declare upon Oath, that Epis-
 "copacy is Jure Divino, which is to make racks for
 "Conscience. There is a Complaint, that when you do
 "not reordain the Priests that come over to you from
 "Rome, you do reordain them that come from the
 "Churches of France and Holland. There is a Com-
 "plaint, that the Bishops have a strange Stiffness for
 "some Ceremonies that are Offensive, and yet they
 "fight for them as pro aris & focis. For God's sake,
 "my Lord, labour to take away all these Causes of Com-
 "plaint, if they be true, to discover their Falselood, if
 "they be forged; And let all Christian Europe know,
 "that there is nothing which the Glory of God, and the
 "Love of his Church call for, which you are not ready
 "to grant. For give me leave to tell you, that it is
 "not enough for your Justification, to prove that your
 "Ministry is lawful, and that it is evil to separate
 "from you; you must farther make appear, that you
 "give no cause nor colour for Separation, but on the con-
 "trary, you do all you can to avoid it. This is the
 general Sense of the Foreign Protestants, whatever
 Idea's some of them may have conceiv'd, at that
 distance, of things that they could not be competent
 Judges of.

But now to return to your Argument: As far
 as we agree with you in Doctrine, *i. e.* the esta-
 blished Publick Doctrine of the Church of England,
 and that, I think, is as far as you agree with one
 another, so far are we as much One, and in Com-
 munion with you, as you are with your selves. If
 Communion in Faith and Doctrine then, be any
 part of Christian Communion, as it was ever, till
 now, thought to be, we are so far no more *Schisma-*
ticks than your selves. But yet that Unity in Faith,
 or Communion in Doctrine, is sufficient to justify

a Separation in some other respects, wherein Communion is necessary or lawful, and as far as it is so, is what I never affirm'd. There may be a Causeless, and so far Schismatical Separation in other respects, tho' it be no damnable Schism; For that which is but a breach of Order and Ecclesiastical Canon, is not damnable; that is, doth not cut Persons off from the Communion of the Catholick Church, nor from Christ the Head, while they are sound in the

Polhil. Disc.
of Schism,
P. 44, 55.

Faith. As Mr. Polhill rightly observes, "Schismatical Separation, says he, is ordinarily, if not always, attended with some Error; as the Novatians, Donatists, Luciferians, and all others, had their propria Dogmata, their corrupt Doctrines. But as for the Non-conformists, adds he, what new Doctrine do they bring? What Error do they propagate? What deadly Poyson is under their Lips? Those are the most dangerous Schismaticks, that depart from the pure Doctrine of the Church. And doth it not concern you, to consider how far Pelagianism hath not only crept into, but spread it self in your Church? And whether it be not from among your selves; that Socinianism and Deism is risen up, and found entertainment too, with some of the Dignify'd Ones of your Communion? Prove it if you can, that those of the Presbyterian way, against whom you so bitterly inveigh, are not as conformable to the established Doctrine of the Church of England, in all the Necessary Articles of Faith, as the most Orthodox of your selves are. So that in this respect, wherein the Vital Union of the Church doth primarily consist, we are not Schismaticks.

But it seems the Unity of Faith is a matter of very little moment with you in this case. The thing in debate, you say, is this, Whether they that went out from us, are still with us; or whether we are both of the same Particular

cular Church, notwithstanding our desertion of this Church, i. e. as you said before, being divided from you as we are?

To solve this Great Question, we must examine these Three things. 1. How far we are One with you. 2. Wherein we are divided from you. 3. How far we may, notwithstanding this Division, be truly said to be One with you.

1. *How far we are One with you?* I shall now mention but these Four things.

1. We are One with you in that *Common Christian Faith*, which was once deliver'd to the Saints; and which is contain'd in the Holy Scriptures, as I have already said.

2. We are One with you in the *Bonds of Christian Charity*, tho' you are, at least some of you, our Enemies without cause: We own it as our Duty, to love you as our Brethren, and are ready to act accordingly on all Occasions: If the bond of Charity be broken between us, we declare it to be wholly on your side, and which we cannot help.

3. We are One with you as far as you are hearty and sincere in the *Common National Protestant Interest*: But if any of you be embark'd in any Secret Intrigues, that tend to the Subversion of the true *English Protestant Rights and Liberties of Church or State*, we declare that we are therein divided from you.

4. We are One with you, and with the Particular Churches to which we are Parochially related, in all the *Common Interests, Offices and Duties that belong to us in our respective Capacities, both Civil and Sacred, as the Laws under which we live require of us*. In all these respects we readily Conform, and wish that all those that call themselves the *Church of England*, were as Conformable as we are.

2. *Wherein we are Divided from you:* And this is, First, In the Places of Publick Worship, and Secondly,

ly, In External Rites and Ceremonies, and Modes of Worship and Discipline. As for the *First*, 'tis notoriously known, that it is not of our own choice, but of a necessity of your making. 'Tis not for any offence we take at those Houses of Publick Worship, which you pretend to have consecrated, and made holier than other Places; but you have driven us out, and will not suffer us to exercise our Worship in them: But to prevent a mistake you were guilty of in your *Vindication*, pray take notice, that I use the Word *you* here, in the Plural number, as speaking of a *Party*, and not a *single Person* only. And as for the *Second*, where the old Core of the Ulcer lies, *viz.* Our dividing from you in External Rites and Ceremonies, this is also confess'd, as to matter of fact; and for this cause it is that you have cast us out of your Communion, and charge us with Schism for not complying with you; which we cannot stately do, till we are better satisfy'd about it, and which we despair ever to be.

3. *How far we may, notwithstanding this Division, be truly said to be one with you.* Now you say, that to affirm that those who are thus divided from you, are still One with you, is to renounce the Use of Words, and to affront the Common sense of Mankind. The truth is, to say that we are One with you in those things, wherein we are divided from you, is *Nonsense* enough; While I am at *London* I am not at *Exeter*, and while I am going East, I am not going West; This is plain Demonstration, and he that will not believe it, deserves not to be disputed with: But the Question is, Whether this be a Schismatical Dividing from you, and a Schism that doth cut us off from the Catholick Church, and from Christ the Head of it? As for the *First*, If a meer Local Separation, and that when Necessity, or Expediency requires it, be *Schismatical*, then are we all *Schismatics*, nor is there any one Particular Church in all
the

the World that is Innocent. As for the *Second*, If difference in External Rites and Ceremonies be that which makes the damnable Schism, then there can be but one sort of Particular Churches in the World that is safe, and perhaps not one, and which of all the Churches that is, no Man can tell, according to your Hypothesis. But let us consider once more, what the Nature and Use of these External Circumstances of Worship and Communion are. That they are of Positive Divine Institution, and consequently Parts of Worship, is not pretended; but that they are only things of Mens own devising and imposing; so that to reject them, is not to reject any Ordinance of God, but of Man; and to say that this is a damnable sin, is a New sort of Divinity, and worse than Pharisaical Superstition. Ceremonies are but the Weeds with which a Worship is cloath'd; or if you strain the relation to the utmost height of it, 'tis but as the Skin to the Body: Now suppose that by some fretting Humour of your Body, or the Application of a *Cautstick* or a *Vesicatory*, &c. the Skin should be taken off round your Arm, so that by the Skin it holds no Communion with the Body, as your other Limbs do, will you say that your Arm is now no part of your Body, but pass the Sentence of *Excision* upon it? Are not the Bone, the Muscles, the Tendons, the Arteries, and the Veins, sufficient to constitute and prove its Union with the Body, notwithstanding this Solution of the Continuity of that, which did but externally cloth them? Why then are not those Churches, or Societies of Christians, which are united in the true Faith, and all the Essentials of Christianity, equally related to Christ the Head, and to one another, as Fellow-Members, tho' they be accidentally divided in Ceremonies and External Forms of outward Visible Communion?

II. You argue, as in your *Discourse of Schism*,
That our Practice is inconsistent with Church
 p. 109. *Government, and, being admitted, would be*
destructive of the Church it self. A very
 high Charge if you could but prove it. But when
 you say *Church-Government*, you should have said
Church-Tyranny and Church-Innovations, with which
 alone our Practice is inconsistent. Why may not
 the Church be as well Govern'd, and by Bishops too,
 as now it is, and that in a far more peaceable man-
 ner, and more to the Honour of its Governours,
 and the ease and Edification of its Members, with-
 out Ceremonies as with them? Or will all Indiffe-
 rent things, left to their Indifferency, as to practice,
 destroy your Church? What a Bubble of a Church
 is that, which will be destroy'd by the loss of an
 empty Ceremony? I told you in my *Letter*, how
 little we are concern'd in your descant on this Argu-
 ment, where you talk of *Seditions, and Mutinies; De-*
posing of Magistrates, and Conspiracies of Children and
Servants against their Fathers and Masters, and of
 the sad effects of these things, as if we were the
 Persons that are guilty of all this, and only because
 you can't perswade us tamely to take on the yoke of
 your Ceremonious Imposition. *This, you say, would*
make all Church-Government a Precarious and Useless
thing; As if Church-Government had no higher Im-
 ployment, than to busy it self about these unne-
 cessary and offensive things, and as if the exercise of
 Church-Discipline and Censures against the Igno-
 rance, Idleness, Drunkenness, Fornications, Simony,
 Litigiousness, Railings, and other Immoralities,
 Scandalous Living, and false Doctrines of the Cler-
 gy, and the abounding Vices of all kinds of the Peo-
 ple, were very Venial Infirmities, and nothing in
 comparison of the neglect of a Church-Ceremony,
 as one of your Coat told a Gentlewoman lately, *that*
to play the Whore, was not so great a Sin, as to go to hear
a Non-

a Non-conformist Preach. But let the World judge how incongruous and impertinent, yea, how Slanderous and Malevolent your Comparisons are. What are the *Seditions*, the *Mutinies*, the *Conspiracies*, the *Rebellions*, that we have been guilty of? You have requir'd such things of us, as we cannot, but to the hazard of our Souls, submit to; for this it is that you have cast us out of your Communion, and prosecuted us with the most unreasonable Severities, all which we have born with patience, and our Souls being justly dearer to us than any thing else in the World, we have provided for them as we have been able, so as to keep our Consciences void of Offence towards God and towards Men. *The Lord God of Gods be* Joh. 22.22,
23, &c.
knoweth, if it be in Rebellion, or if in transgression against the Lord, that we have built our Altars, or form'd our Separate Assemblies, to turn from following the Lord, or in Opposition to you, our Protestant Brethren; if it be not rather that we might not be utterly shut out of God's Inheritance, and live without his Ordinances, which he hath commanded us, or else defile his Worship, and wound our Consciences with such things, as we verily believe he hath condemned, then spare us not. As we live under the same *Civil Government*, so we would as gladly live under the *Ecclesiastical* too, were not those unreasonable, and ensnaring things requir'd of us, which consist not with the Peace of our own Consciences, and which are that Burden, which neither We nor our Fathers have been able to bear. In what Sense shall we understand the Causeless Separation, as you always call it? As we are Passive in it, and Separated from you without just Cause. So let it be call'd Causeless: But our doing as we do, being thus Causeless cast out by you, is not without a Cause, which we are perswaded will justify us before our Great Judge at last,

last, and before the greater part of his Churches upon Earth too.

III. To your Third Topick from your New Notion of Schism, you have very little to rejoyne. This Notion or Description of Schism you give us, *Discourse of Schism*, p. 66. in these words, *It is a Causeless breach of outward Ecclesiastical Communion; which you divided into a Schism within a Church, and a Schism from a Church.* Under the first Sort you reckon'd that of the Church of Corinth, 1 Cor. 3. 4. *Where one said, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollas, &c.* But this being but a Schism within a Church, and not appearing on what particular ground or occasion it was there bred, I told you, did not give us the full Notion of Schism, according to your own Apprehension of it, nor doth it reach to us, to whom you apply it, unless you can prove our Separation from you, to be on our part Causeless. All that you say to it now, is but this, *That you could not foresee, that any one would affirm, that Schism in the Church was indeed about Discipline, but Schism out of the Church only about matters of Doctrine.* You thought that both agreed in the Common Nature of Schism, and only differ'd in Degree. But pray who was it that did affirm this, or any thing like it? This indeed looks to me like perfect Dream and Delirium; not only Impertinent but Incoherent.

IV. Your Last Argument, to prove that
p. 111. Unity of Faith is not sufficient to free us from the Guilt of Schism, was this, *Because this takes away the distinction of the Schismatics from the Approved: And to make this good, you tell us,*

1. *It is evident from Scripture, that the Approved, who are the Beloved of God, add this to the Practice of other Duties, that they live in Conformity to the Church, and are of a Regular behaviour in it.* May I not ask you now, Do you not here make their Continu-

ance

ance in outward Communion with the Church, that is, the Church to which they particularly belong, whether Sound or Unsound, for you here make no difference, the *χαρακτηριστικὴ* or Distinguishing Mark of their being the Approved, and the Beloved of God? For whatever they be in other respects, as to *Faith* or *Practice*, 'tis That which gives them the Character. But do we not find, and that without any Critical search or observation, how commonly this Character is found on the most Prophanes and Profligate Livers, and that in your own Church of England? So that what I there said, is no piece of *Railery on the Apostle*, as you causelessly call it, nor on your Church, of which you are so tender, but the natural Consequent of your own Argument. For let Persons be never so sound in the Faith, on Circumspect in their Lives, this is not that which declares them to be the *Approved and Beloved of God*, but a Conformity to the Church in its Humane Rites and Ceremonies. This, it seems, is that which Sanctifies all; These are the *Approved and Beloved Ones*, let them be otherwise what they will. This is a new, and very odd sort of Protestantism. For what you say, as to their practice of other Duties, it signifies but little, while 'tis their Outward Conformity that you measure their Character by. When the Apostle says, *There must be Heresies, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you*, 1 Cor. 11. 19. What is it, according to your Interpretation, that the Apostle means by Heresies, to which he opposes the Divine Approbation; you can by Heresies understand nothing else but Non-conformity to your Beloved Rites and Ceremonies, which is the only Thing you have set your self to fight for, and therefore press all that you any where meet with into your Service. But you say, *I had not the Confidence in my Letter, to deny, that what you argued from the Apostle's words, was agreeable to the*

Apostle's Sense. My *Letter* is still open to any that will be at the pains to read it ; where it appears, how far I granted your Arguing from the Apostle's Words, and where I told you, that the same Argument serves indifferently both for *Rome* and *You* ; and more to that purpose, which you take no notice of. Now 'tis true, the Apostle had, in the Precedent Verse, charg'd them with *αἰσματα Divisions*, that were among them ; but what the Matter, or Ground of these Schisms was, he doth not particularly say, only what may be gathered from *ver. 21, 22* where he says, *In eating every one taketh before her his own Supper, and one is hungry and another is drunken.* This was a great Disorder in their Meetings, and sprang not only from a want of Charity, but from a Superstitious, and false Opinion, that tho' the Supper of the Paschal Lamb was to cease, Christ the Antitype being come, yet that they ought to have a *Private Supper* of their own, in Imitation of the *Jewish Passover*, to precede this of Christ's own Institution, which was but a piece of *Jewish Bigottry*, and founded on an Errour in Doctrine ; For this the Apostle reproves them, as that which was the way to break them into Parties and Factions, and forbids them to bring these their Feasts into the Christian Church, or Assembly ; but if they would keep up these *Suppers*, they should do it at home, in their own Private Houses, and not disturb the Church with these Unnecessary things. *What have ye not Houses to eat and to drink in, or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not ?* So then, it is clear that the Schisms, or Divisions he here censures, were wholly on their part, who were for the Observation of these unrequired *Jewish Rites*, or *Inventions* of their own, and which they were not only naturally, but by long Education, addicted to ; Hence sprung the Schism and the Disorder that was among them. For, says the Apostle.

postle, there must be *Heresies* amongst you, that they which are approved may be made manifest amongst you. There must *non necessitate absoluta, nec Præcepti, sed consequentiæ*, that is, there will be *Heresies* amongst you. The next Question then will be, Whether *Heresies* in this *Verse*, be the same as Divisions in the *Precedent*? They must indeed be very near of kin, and much to the same purpose, or else we can't clear the Coherence of the Apostle's Argument; but whatever the Etymology of the Word will bear, it is certain that by Ecclesiastical Usage, it is commonly restrain'd to signify *perverse Opinions in matters of Doctrine*, and of which Men are stubbornly Tenacious, and so the relation the word bears to that of Schisms, or Divisions, in the precedent *Verse*, is the same as is between the *Cause* and the *Effect*; Errors in Judgment being the common Cause of Schisms and Factions in Practice; So that *Heresies* here primarily signify *Errors in Doctrine*: Had they not first dissented in Judgment, they would have agreed in Practice; And in this Sense *Heresy* is oppos'd to *Approved, Sæpius Probi vel Probati*, which imports both the Soundness of their Faith, and the Sincerity of their Hearts;

Dum se opponunt doctrinarum corruptelis & Sæctis, fidei sinceritatem cum Synops. Crit.
in Loc.
charitate retinentes. So then, those

that are sound in the Essentials of Faith, tho' they be guilty of some Factionous Disorders, as to outward Communion, are not therefore by the Apostle to be charg'd with damnable Schism, or which cuts them off from Christ; for 'tis by their *Faith* that they are vitally united to him, and to one another, and not by their *External Rites and Ceremonies*. And besides, the Schisms the Apostle here censures, were occasion'd by those that were so Zealous for the *Externals* of Worship of their devising, with a *Supercilious contempt* of others. And now what
Service

Service this Text hath done you, or is capable of doing for you, you may sit down and consider.

2. You tell us, that the *Dividers of the Church*, however they agree with her in *Doctrine*, are not to be reckon'd amongst the *Approv'd*, because they are not so while they remain in her *Communion*, much less when they proceed to *Separation*. And for this you think the words of *St. John* are very remarkable and pertinent, 1 *John* 2. 19. They went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us. Let us now soberly examine the true Sense of the Apostle in this Text, *They went out from us*; And who were They? The Antecedent you have in the immediately preceding Verse, whom there he calls *Antichrists*, *Even now there are many Antichrists*; And of what sort are these? Hereticks, Idolaters, and Apostates from the Purity of the Doctrine and Worship of the Gospel, and who were the Fore-runners of the *Great Antichrist*, or *Man of Sin*, whose coming was predicted, 2 *Thess.* 2. Those who were never found in the Faith, tho' once in Outward Communion with us, went out from us, because they were but a Company of Ceremonious Superstitious Hypocrites, and never sincerely of us, but having taken up their Profession on meer External and Carnal Arguments, when these fail, they are gone, and fall away, as Leaves in Autumn. So that the Apostle here speaks of *Antichristian Apostates*, and not of meer *Schismaticks*, who had they been found in the Faith, they had not fallen away: But Apostacy and Schism are two things, differing *toto genere*. By *Apostacy* the Church is no more really hurt, than a Tree by the loss of its Leaves in Winter; but by *Schism*, its green Branches are rent and divided, and put into great disorder, tho' not quite broken off from the living Stock, but still deriving

iving Life and Nourishment from it. And those of whom the Apostle is here speaking, being of the Antichristian Race, and the very *Spawn* of which those *Frogs* were bred, which he saw in his Vision, *Rev.* 16. 13. and that Man of Sin, who hath since been more fully revealed: I take it to be a Text that more nearly concerns those, that symbolize more with the Apostate Church in those Superstitious Rites of their own Invention, and those Doctrines that have been devis'd to support them, than it doth those whom you now call *Schismatics*. Therefore how *remarkably and pertinently* this Scripture, in the true Sense of it, serves your occasion, I shall leave to the Judgment of the Learned and Impartial Reader.

II. The Second thing you allowed us Page 113. as an Argument to defend our selves against the Guilt of Schism, and on which you now reflect, is a *Supposition* that there were Separate and Independent Churches, one of Jews, the other of Gentile Converts, planted in the Apostles days, in the same City: For which Dr. Hammond hath been cited, who affirms, that it was so done by the Apostle's own Direction and Order. But you say, that the Doctor only thought that it was so tolerated at first, but that the Breach was to be made up, as soon as possible, as he affirms it was done, (but doth not tell us how long it was tolerated, or whether it held not at least till the Temple and City of Jerusalem was destroy'd by the Romans) and therefore, say you, it could not be design'd as an Example to future times. But,

1. Then it appears that it was for a time, and that perhaps more than One hundred Years tolerated, and therefore was tolerable, and consistent with Catholick Unity: And if such a tolerated Division of External Communion did not destroy the Catholick Union then, I cannot understand why it should necessarily do so now.

2. What

2. What you say *was not design'd for an Example to future times*, must be understood with Caution. That it was not design'd by the Apostles, that such Superstitions and Factions should be encouraged in the Church, or that these Jewish Rites and Ceremonies should be continued for ever, or any other of Men's Invention set up in the room of them, I do indeed believe; But as it was an Exercise of Christian Charity, Prudence and Moderation, towards weak Brethren, that could not, but by length of time, be wean'd from those Religious Rites they had been educated in, and which they still, tho' ignorantly, held as Sacred, so far, I think, it was design'd as an Example to future times in the like cases; or else all those Apostolical Rules and Precepts which are given by them in such cases, are of no use to us.

But then you say you have prov'd, that there was no such Division of outward Communion in the Apostles days. But when, or where, or by what *Mediums* you have prov'd it, I have not yet found, unless we must believe, that your saying something about it, is proving it. For this I find you have done in your *Discourse of Schism*, p. 136, &c. Where you have four things, which you call Arguments, to prove it by.

1. Your first Argument you take from the *Design of Christ*, which was to unite both Jews and Gentiles in one body, and to make of the Two, one New Man; and accordingly he made of both one People, prescrib'd to them the same Law, and conferr'd on them equal Priviledges. All this shall be granted, That he gave them the same Saviour, the same Covenant, the same Priviledges, and the same Ordinances, that were necessary to their Salvation; and in all these respects they were *One People*, that is, *One Catholick Church*: But doth it therefore follow, that they must presently have all the same External Rites and Ceremonies? Or could they

they not be one Body, because they were not of one Outward Communion? May you not as well say, that a Man's Children are not all one *Family*, because they can't lye altogether in one *Cradle*? or because they are not all of one *Complexion*, or of one *Age*? or because that some can't put on the *Cloaths* that some others of them wear. And that our Saviour did not design that they should be presently *One*, in these respects, appears by what he says, *Luke 5. 37. No Man putteth New Wine into Old Bottles: And Verse 39. No Man also having drunk Old Wine, straightway desireth New, for he saith the Old is better.* Accordingly the Apostles did bear with the Jewish Converts in these things, of which they were so Zealous, till they could, by better Instruction, and length of time, be wean'd from them, knowing that it was not in these things that their Unity did principally consist. *For the Kingdom of God is not Meat and Drink, but Righteousness, and Peace, and Joy, in the Holy Ghost, Rom. 14. 17. In Christ Jesus neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but Faith, which worketh by love, Gal. 5. 6.* Therefore when you talk of the *Partition Wall*, which you say, *Vind. p. 115. Our Lord Himself had demolished, and which the Apostles would not allow the building up again:* You seem not rightly to understand what the *Partition Wall* was, or how far it was then demolished. The *Partition Wall* was not the Jewish Rites and Ceremonies, which he calls the *Law of Commandments contain'd in Ordinances, Eph. 2. 15.* simply consider'd; For Religious Rites and Ceremonies, tho' not the same, were common both to *Jews* and *Gentiles*; But it was the *Peculiarity of the Covenant*, of which the Jewish Ceremonies were the Outward Signs and Appendages, this was the ground of the Enmity that was between them, *Rom. 3. 12.* That the one should be ac-
counted,

counted, and by their Sacred *Rituals*, declar'd to be the *Peculiar People of God*, and the other *Accursed*. Therefore when Christ came into the World, and had erected his Gospel Kingdom, he is said to destroy this *Enmity*, not so much by altering or abolishing these Ceremonies, as by enlarging his Church and Kingdom, and taking in the *Gentiles* with the *Jews* into the same Covenant, without those painful Ceremonies to which the *Jews* and all their *Proselytes* were oblig'd: And thus was the *Old Enmity* fundamentally destroy'd; so that the Ceremonies were only *Secundarily*, and *Secundum quid*, the *Wall of Partition* between them. And yet as far as it was so, this *Wall* was demolished, that is, as to the Obligation of it, but as to the Being and Use of it, not all at once, but by little and little, and was a Work of time, as I have already said. Neither was the Apostle's bearing with this Weakness of the *Jews*, tho' in separate Communion, a rebuilding of the *Wall of Partition*, as you suggest, unless you will grant us, that a *Toleration* is the same with an *Establishment*, and so set us on a level with your selves. Besides, if *Rites and Ceremonies* were the *Partition Wall*, which you say Christ had by his Cross demolished, and therefore ought not to be rebuilt; How is it that you go about, with all your might, to rebuild this *Wall of Partition* between us and the Church of *England*? Are you not herein Self-condemn'd? And you may, for your Instruction, observe too, that in the Apostle's days, it was the way of the *Gentile Churches*, which is called the *κατὰ λόγον* the Rational Worship, and Pure from the Blendishments of Humane Devices, that was the *Established* way of the Church, and the more *Ceremonious* way of the *Jews* was but the *Tolerated*; But between *Us* and *You* this Apostolical Order is now revers'd. Hence I conclude against your first Argument; That notwithstanding the Union which
Christ

Christ hath by his Cross made between Jew and Gentile, they might, and it is evident enough, that they did, for a long time after, continue to be of Two Distinct Communions, differing in External Rites and Ceremonies.

2. Your second Argument you take from St. Paul's labouring to restore Peace and Conformity between the Judaizers and other Christians, that they might live together as Members one of another; and shews, that this difference should be no cause of a breach of Communion amongst them; for, says he to the Strong, who were apt to despise others, *Him that is weak in Faith, receive to you; that is, notwithstanding his Scruples, admit him into the Congregation, as a Brother.* And the thing then requir'd of them, both the Weak and the Strong, you say, was, that they should meet together in the same Assemblies, and unanimously joyn in the same Prayer and Praises, as if they had been animated by one Soul. This is the Sum of this Argument, give me leave to animadvert a little on it.

1. When you say, *The Apostle laboured to Restore Conformity between the Judaizers and other Christians,* I would ask you,

1. Whether this Conformity were then Lost among them? If it was, then were there Separate Communions of Conformists and Nonconformists in those days: If it was not, then it is improper to talk of Restoring it.

2. When you say *Conformity*, I would ask, to What? or what was the *Established Form*, to which the rest must Conform? Must the Judaizers Conform to the other Christians, or these other to them? The Weak to the Strong, or the Strong to the Weak? If the First, and the same Rule hold good still; then those that are for Ceremonies, ought to conform to those that are against them; and so You will be found to be the *Nonconformists*, and not We: But if the latter, this must be prov'd, and that
against

against the whole Scope of the Apostle's Arguments in all his Epistles on this Subject: And very Unreasonable it is too; because those that were for Ceremonies, you here acknowledge to be the *Weak*, but tho' the *Strong* ought charitably to bear with the *Weak*; yet that they should put themselves under their Power, and receive their Laws and Rules of Conformity from them, is very Unreasonable and Unnatural. And most evident it is, by all the Writings of the Apostles, that there is nothing in the World more contrary to that Spirit, by which the Apostles were guided, and that way wherein they walked with the Churches, than what you now call *Conformity*.

2. When you say, That notwithstanding the Scruples of these *Weak* ones, that were such Zealots for their Old Ceremonies, they ought to be admitted into the Congregation as Brethren: I say so too; and accordingly we are ready to admit any of the Church of England into our Congregations, so that they do not impose their Ceremonies as a Law on us; For this was that St. Paul was always against, and which he once blam'd Peter himself for, and withstood him to the face; Tho' among the *Jews* he could occasionally comply with them in their Rites, yet would by no means suffer these things to be impos'd upon the *Gentiles*.

3. When you say, That the things requir'd of them, both the *Strong* and the *Weak*, was, that they should meet together in the same Assemblies, and unanimously joyn in the same Prayers and Praises. This needs a little Confirmation, as well as Explanation, what you mean by the same Prayers and Praises, or to shew us what were the *Liturgies* of those days. But doth the Apostle in either of these Chapters *Rom. 14* or *15*. to which you refer, and where he exhorts to receive them that were weak in the Faith, and to glorifie God with one Mind, and with one Mouth, speak of their

their meeting together in One Place, or their joining in the same External Rites and Ceremonies of Worship? Not a word of that; Which is but a Fiction of your own, at least an unprov'd Assertion. Or was it impossible for them to receive one another as Christian Brethren, or to glorify God with one Heart, and one Mouth, without an Uniformity of External Rites and Forms of Worship? Did not all the true Churches of Christ, tho' never so distant in Place, or differing in External Modes and Circumstances, glorify God with one Mind and one Mouth, while the *Object*, and all the *Essentials* of their Worship was one and the same. And tho' we should grant that the Apostle would not that the Gentile Christians, to whom he was writing, should refuse Communion with the Judaizers, nor reject them on the account of this their Weakness, but that they should unite, on all occasions, in Local and Outward Communion, yet we cannot imagine that he could expect it any further than the thing was Practicable. As for their Eating or Forbearing of certain Meats, and the Observing of Days, and some other things, which might be done, and born with, without infringing the Liberty of others, or disturbing the Order and Peace of their Communion, they might and ought to be indulg'd, till God should make them wiser. And we may observe too, that this was but among the *Gentile Churches*, where the *Established Rule of Worship* was against *Ceremonies* in the Apostles days, and where but few of the *Jewish Converts* were, and therefore no such need of Separate Communion; but where their Number was great, and their Zeal high, as in some of the *Gentile Churches* nearest to *Jerusalem*, there was more need of allowing them *Separate Communion*; Nor can you prove that it was not so; For it is certain that the Differences and Distances between *Jew* and *Gentile* were very great,

K

and

and irreconcilable, as to Rites and Ceremonies, and inconsistent with the Unity of External Communion; therefore in those things wherein they so differ'd, they could not possibly be of

Amos 3. 3. one Communion. *Can Two walk together except they be agreed?* But as for the

Churches of the Circumcision, where the old Mo-
saical Ordinances were still held Sacred, it is un-
deniable that the Gentiles could no more presume
to seek for Communion there, without being so-
lemnly Profelyted to a full Conformity, than a poor
Non-conformist can now presume into one of your
Pulpits, without an Oath of full Conformity to you.

3. I shall not need to say much to your Third
Argument, but only repeat your own words, with
the plain and palpable sense of the Scriptures you
allude to. You say the Apostle us'd great tenderness
towards the Dissenting Parties, whether they understood
their Christian Liberty, or whether they did not; yet
when the Judaizers [who were the main sticklers
for Ceremonies] withdrew themselves from [or E-
jected and Excommunicated] those that would not
come up to their Rigours [or submit and subscribe to
their Impositions, and Terms of Communion] and
labour'd to seduce [or to compel] as many as they
could, into the way of Separation, [for it is evident
that it was the Ceremonious Judaizers that were
the Separatists] he then treated them in

Eph. 1. 7, 8. another Stile, he represented them as per-
sons that corrupted the Gospel, and pro-
nounced an Anathema against them. Speaking of them
to the Philippians, he says, Beware of

Phil. 3. 2. those Dogs, [those Superstitious perse-
cuting Bigots] beware of evil workers,
[that are more for the Shadow than the Substance
of Religion,] beware of the Concision, that is, of those
that cut the Church in pieces. [As those of the Cir-
cumcision were in contempt call'd.] And to the
Romans

Romans he says, *I beseech you brethren, mark them which cause Divisions and Offences, [that impose Offensive Conditions of Communion on their Brethren, and cast them out for not complying contrary to the Liberty of the Gospel, and the Sentiments of their Consciences,] contrary to the Doctrine which ye have learned, [which requires no such things of you, but that you stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangl'd again with the yoke of bondage,] and avoid them.* So far was this Apostle from approving or allowing of their Separate Congregations, [of which he hath spoken never a word,] but much farther may we well suppose him to be from allowing that which was the just cause of a Separation. Thus if you would but suffer the Scripture to speak out its own sense freely, you will hear it speak in our Justification, and to your own conviction. But believe it, Sir, the Muzzling of a Text will never make it your Friend, nor keep it from biting you at last.

4. Your Fourth Argument is but a Practical Comment on the same Subject; shewing us from *Gal. 2. 11, 12, 13, 14.* how justly *Paul* shew'd his Zeal against *Peter* Himself for his stickling with the *Jews* for their *Rites and Ceremonies*, and endeavouring to obtrude them on the *Gentile Churches*, contrary to the Constitution of the Gospel. This was that *Paul* was so offended with *Peter* for; Not for Worshipping God, tho' in a Separate Communion, with the *Jews* after their Manner, which he might have done, and have been blameless, and as *James* among the *Jews* did, but for compelling the *Gentiles* to live as did the *Jews*. Where he plainly asserts a Difference, yea, an Inconsistence between the One and the Other, and which amounts to little less than Demonstration, that the *Jews* and *Gentiles* were at that time of distinct Communions, in those Exter-

nals of Worship, wherein they differ'd. Nay, 'twas not only Lawful, but Prudent and Adviseable to keep these Two Sorts of Christians in Separate Outward Communions, as the best Expedient to preserve the Common Peace, till these *Jewish* Zealots could be better convinc'd of their Mistakes, and reduc'd to the Simplicity of the Gospel; but the joyning them together was the way either to defile the Christian Churches with their *Jewish* Superstitions, and so to settle that Yoke upon them, which Christ had dy'd to deliver us from, or else to embroil them in endless Strifes and Contentions about them. And now, Sir, because you think I had said too little in my *First Letter*, where I design'd the greatest Brevity that Matters would allow, I have now endeavour'd to make you some Recompense; All which labour you might have prevented, had you but rightly consider'd, that it was not simply, or directly against *Separation*, or *distinct Communions*, but against *Schismatical and Superstitious Impositions*, that the Apostle was disputing.

III. The Third thing which you next reflect on, as our Argument is this. *That we meet together in the Name of Christ, and therefore are assur'd of his favourable Presence in the midst of us.* To which I answer'd, That we never own'd this as a Reason of our Separation from your Communion, nor as an Argument to justify it; And as for the Quotation you gave us out of *Cyprian*, and now make some Repetition of in your *Vindication*, than which nothing could be more abusive, or impertinent: You might as much to your purpose have transcrib'd any other piece of an old Tragical Story as this. Whether you will derive the Name of *Novatians*, with whom you compare us, from *Novatas* of *Carthage*, one of *Cyprian's* Presbyters, or Domestick Chaplains, who kickt his Wife on the Belly while
big

big with Child, and caus'd her to miscarry, and then to deliver himself from the Censure of his *Ordinary*, and Master *Cyprian*, who was then an Exile under the *Decian* Persecution, joyn'd himself with *Falicissimus* a Deacon, and broach'd an Erroneous Doctrine, in point of Discipline, in his own defence; *That Persons fallen into any open Sin ought to be receiv'd into Communion, without the Imposing any Penance, or Publick Profession of Repentance.* Or else from *Novatianus* of Rome, who of a Stoick Philosopher, was made a Priest *per Saltum*, who afterward in opposition to *Cornelius*, who was chosen Pope, having gotten to him some of *Cyprian's* Deserters, of which *Novatus* was One, and several *Roman* Confessors on his side, sent for Three or Four of the most Ignorant, and badly Princip'l'd Bishops of *Italy*, whom, when he had fuddl'd, he perswaded to Ordain him Bishop of Rome, and so rais'd a Sedition against *Cornelius*; and to strengthen himself and his Party, broach'd such Errours about Penance, and other acts of Discipline, as were like to be most pleasing to that part of the Mob that adher'd to him. Wherefore before you had apply'd *Cyprian's* words on that case to us, you ought in justice to have prov'd us to be Persons of the same Character and Conversation, and that our Separation from you is as *Causeless*, and as *Voluntary* as theirs was; Otherwise you do but expose your self to the severe Censure of all wise and impartial Judges.

IV. The Fourth thing you were pleas'd in your Discourse to call our Argument, was this. *That Paul rejoiced that Christ was Preach'd even by those Men, that did it out of Envy and Strife; and if the case of our Preachers were as bad as this, as long as they Preach Christ, we have no reason to be Sollicitous about their Call, nor you to be offended at their Work.* This Argument I

put, as I did the rest, into Logical Order, and then disown'd it, as that which you had foisted on us;

And how I further answer'd it, is to be seen in my *Letter*; and which your *Vindication* doth not make it necessary

Letter p. 62. to repeat. Only you tell me, that, *Vindic. p. 118.* wanting something to skirmish with, I imputed to you what you had not said. The Truth of which will easily appear by comparing your Words and mine, upon that Argument. Did you not expressly affirm, that we did usurp the Sacred Function without a Call to the Office? And did you not compare us, in Three other respects; to them that envied and griev'd the Apostle *Paul*? And was there any thing of a Strain in the Reflections that I there made upon it? Wherefore for you to say that I accus'd you with what I knew to be false, is a little too dirty for a Person of your Figure.

V. The Fifth Argument which you drew up for us was this, *That we are only return'd*
Vind. p. 119. to those whom we had forsaken before;
 and that we ought to do this, since we had

the Indulgence, or the Liberty granted to us by the Law. On what I answer'd to this, in my *Letter*, you now make your insulting Repartees, and shew more of the Disease of your Spleen, than of the Soundness of your Judgment. Your main Attack is to invalidate our Right to the Act of Indulgence, and what can be reasonably concluded from that, but that your Fingers itch to be again at your old Persecuting Work with us, and to shew how you gnash

your Teeth at us? You tell us, *That*
Disc. p. 152. the Act of Indulgence was only design'd to give Liberty to Tender Consciences, but ours, you say, are not of that number. What is it then that holds your hands? Is it your Good Nature, or something else, that you do not fall upon us, while we have no Law to defend us? Your

Argument

Argument is this, and wherein the strength of all that you have to object against us lies ; *That when we did come to your Churches, you believe we did not come with doubts and fears upon us that our Compliance was Unlawful, but were generally well assur'd that it was consistent with our Duty, and agreeable to the Holy Scriptures : But this, you say, is the very thing that cuts us off from the Indulgence which we claim by Law, that being design'd only for Persons of another Character ; What was Lawful before the Indulgence, is Lawful still, and what was Sinful then is Sinful still.* This is your Argument. Indeed I have sometime heard a Silly Woman confidently raving at this rate ; but I know the time, when if a *Junior Soph* should have urg'd so gross a *Fallacy* in Disputation, he would have been hiss'd out of the *Schools* : And tho' I think I have already said enough to shame the Vanity of it, yet because 'tis what you are always insisting on, as if it were an *Indisputable First Principle*, and what you now give a fresh Occasion to reflect on, I shall give you that close Attendance, I promis'd you in all your Motions ; but be as short as I can. That it is not in the power of any Humane Law to alter the Moral Nature of things, I alway asserted, and do so still ; but that what is Lawful, or Necessary, and what is Unlawful, or Sinful at one time, is so at all times, and under all Circumstances, I never knew any Man of Sense, besides your self, that had the forehead to affirm ; nor can I believe that you do really think so, *a Secundum quid ad absolute, non valet Consequentia.* Did you never hear of that common Distinction, of the *Absolute and Comparet act of the Will* ? Should the Seaman throw his Owner's Goods overboard, when there is no need to do it, would he not be guilty ? But to do it when he must else lose Ship, and Goods, and Lives, and all, is not only Lawful, but prudentially Necessary. Pray consider, whether by this your Fal-

K 4

lacious

lacious arguing, you do not only damn us the present Dissenters, but the whole Protestant Reformation too : And whether this Doctrine of yours be so free from Reflection on the Wisdom and Justice of the Government, that hath granted us our Liberty, is that which belongs not so much to me, as to the Law-givers Themselves to determine ; For the least that can be made of it, is the manifestation of your Discontent at what they have done ; But *Male-contents* in a Government are none of the best *Friends* to it.

But why should it seem strange, that some of those that were once in Communion with you, are now gone from you ? May there not be, not only *Occasions*, but good *Reasons* for it to ? I mention'd Two Reasons in my *Letter*, p. 73.

1. There was a time when many of those, who have now forsaken your Communion, did know no better. That Mens Understandings are capable of Improvement, I hope you will grant ; and that every one ought to act according to the present Dictates of his Practical Understanding. Now while they were in your Communion, partly thro' the Prejudice of their Education, partly thro' Inexperience, and partly thro' the ill Opinion their Leaders, or some of their Neighbours, or Familiars had form'd in their Minds, and the Persecutions that were rais'd against us, they were held in Communion with you ; who were like those *Jews*, Acts 28. 22. that told *Paul*, *As concerning this Sect, we know that every where it is spoken against ;* But after they had heard what *Paul* had to say, *Some believed, and some believed not.* This was the case of many of those that now hear us, who are ready to acknowledge that it was their *Ignorance* and *Prejudice*, that held them so long in your Communion.

2. There was a time when they could get no better ; When thro' the Violence of your Persecutions,

tions, the Non-conforming Ministers, like the Lord's Prophets in *Ahab's* time, lay hid, and the work made to cease, as that of the *Temple* did in the days of *Rehum* and *Shimshai*, *Ezra* 4. 24. And this laid them under a necessity of making use of what they had with you, which as many as accounted it not absolutely sinful to do, did, by a compare act of the Will, chuse to do, rather than to live in the utter neglect of God's Publick Worship; And this I illustrated by that *Familiar Similitude*, with which you are so offended. As for the *Summer-Flies* you upbraid me with, they are but those of your own *Breed*, that are acted on no Principles, but that of Novelty, or Worldly Interest, that are but swarm'd off from your own *Hives*, and will return to you again, when the next *Storm* rises. But particularly to discern who these are, is more than either You or We can do, till by the Event it be declar'd, till when, the same Charity is due to them both from Us, and from You. So then, our Consciences do not condemn us for what we once did in compliance with you, when we either knew, or could obtain no better, and yet are as far as ever from allowing us to yield you that Conformity you require of us.

VI. The Sum of what you gave us for our Sixth Argument is this, That the *Way of the Separation* is preferable to that of the *Disc.* p. 134. Church of England. To which you answer'd by a General Concession, That we ought indeed to desire and seek after the most Excellent things; But then, you say, we must do it in a *Sutable* manner: Whether you intend any Crotchet or Strain in the Word *Sutable*, I cannot tell; but if you mean, that it must be sought in an honest, and the best and most peaceable manner that we can, we are so far agreed.

But

But then you come to the *Particular Reasons* which, you say, *some have given for preferring the way of the Separation before that of the Church of England* : And reduce them to these Three Heads.

That in their present way they enjoy purer Ordinances.

That it affords them Communion with a better People.

That it most conduces to their Edification.

All which, you say, are at once cut off by the *sinfulness of the Separation*. But I hope not before you have prov'd the Separation to be Sinful.

1. *That in the Way of Separation they enjoy purer Ordinances, freer from Ceremony, and the addition of things not commanded.* But to this you think you have said so much in your *First and Third Sections*, that you should not think it necessary to add any more upon the Subject, were it not for some *Objections*, that ly in your way, that you may leave nothing untouch'd (tho' but touch'd) that hath the Appearance of an *Argument*. And what I have also already reply'd to these your *First and Third Sections*, will make it unnecessary to say much more here. But now for your *Particulars*.

1. *It is Objected, that your Ecclesiastical Rites and Ceremonies are against the Rules of Scriptural Worship and Gospel Simplicity.* But to confute this, you speak very confidently, that this *Simplicity*, if the *Apostle Himself* understood what he ment by it, is never oppos'd to *Ceremonies* ; but only to *Falshood and Hypocrisy*, because you find it so us'd in some places. But if *Simple and Compound* be *Opposite Terms*, then is it as properly and directly oppos'd to *Humane Rites and Ceremonies*, as it is to *Hypocrisy*, 2 Cor. 1. 12. It is oppos'd to *Fleshly Wisdom* ; but the *Fleshly Wisdom*, as it is exercis'd about the matters of God's *Worship*, appears in the devising and imposing of those *Pompons, Mystical Rites, and significant Ceremonies*,

nies, whereby it pretends to adorn the Worship; and in this Sense it seems to be, that the Apostle here uses it, *Why as tho' living in the World are ye subject to Ordinances*, Col. 2. 20. *After the Commandments and Doctrines of Men; Which things have indeed a shew of Wisdom in Will-worship*, Ver. 22, 23. What was the main Scope of his Epistle to the *Galatians*, but to confirm them in their *Christian Liberty*, against those *Rites and Ceremonies*, which some would have obtruded on them? And with what a warmth of Zeal doth he express himself in that case, calls it a *perverting of the Gospel of Christ*, Chap. 1. 7. and pronounces an *Anathema*, ver. 8, 9. and wishes that they were cut off that troubled them with these things, Chap. 5. 12. And that it was not Heresies in Doctrine that he so inveighs against, but the abolished Rites and Ceremonies, wherewith the pure Worship of God began then to be adulterated, appears by his Discourse all along, *How turn ye again to the Weak and Beggarly Elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in Bondage? Ye observe Days, and Months, and Times, and Years; I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain*, Chap. 4. 9, 10, 11. And whereas you are still so confident to affirm, that the Apostle enjoyn'd and approv'd those Ceremonies you mention'd in your former Sections, I refer you, and my Readers, to what I have there answer'd in Confutation of it, it being evident, that there was nothing in the World that the Apostle *Paul* was more averse to, than these things, of which you are so excessively fond.

2. You argued, *That if the Church had Power to lay aside some Rites, which were prescrib'd by St. Paul himself, it hath Power also to appoint others of the like nature.* To which I answer'd in my Letter p. 79. That because a Church hath power to purge it self of some unnecessary and offensive Vanities, it doth not follow that it hath therefore power to introduce

duce others ; which I illustrated by the Example of the *Brazen Serpent*, which when it came to be abused, *Hezekiah* had power to take it down, that it might no longer stand as an Instrument of Idolatry in that Church ; yet had not therefore power to erect another thing of his own Invention, in the room of it, which had he done, would have deserv'd no better name than a *Gamble* ; For if *Hezekiah*, and the People with him, might (without offence) call that *Symbole* of God's own erecting, when Idolatrously abused, by a name of contempt, *Nebishtan*, I suppose we may call that which is but of Man's Invention, and unwarrantable obtruding on God's Worship, a *Gamble*; yea, and call those Ceremonies too, which were never of Apostolical Institution, at least when become Scandalous, and justly to be abandon'd, *Offensive and Unnecessary Vanities*, without the danger of *Libelling against Religion*, or of *Burlesquing* on it, as you so very wittily suggest. But so Sacred a thing is a Ceremony with you, that there must not a hard word be spoken of it, tho' it be become never so Scandalous. By which it appears, what it is that you place your Religion in.

But what you mean by your coming to the matter at which I aim, I do not understand, or to what purpose you tell me, *That as nothing*
Vind. p.127. less than an Almighty Power could give a
Miraculous Vertue to the Brazen Serpent,
and nothing less could take it away ; So no less Authority can abrogate a Law, or Constitution, than that which made it. That it was an Almighty Power that gave the *Brazen Serpent* that *Miraculous Vertue*, cannot be deny'd; but what was it that took away that Vertue, but the Peoples Sin in turning it into an Idol? Or where do you read of any particular Order, that God gave *Hezekiah*, for the taking it away? Was not the Abuse of it sufficient to make it,

it, not only warrantable, but Commendable, to do it? That which is appointed but as a *Mean*, if it obtain not its good *End*, but destroys it, is *ipso facto* void. As for the Ceremonies of Men's Devising and Constituting, how Expedient soever they might seem to be in their Original, when they become Offensive, they lose their End, and the Authority of their Institution, and ought to be rejected, whether the Human Authority, that set them up, will be perswaded to take them away, or no. For otherwise you sin in laying aside any of the Rites of the Church of *Rome*, without that Churches Leave and Authority. And whether you will lay this as a guilt on the *Reformation*, I cannot tell.

3. You are offended with me for saying, *Why should not the Scripture determine to us what is Decent and Orderly in the Worship of God?* But this *Question*, you say, might more fitly have been propos'd to the Sacred Pen-men. Here you give us another rare *Specimen* of your Ingenuity: As if it had not been plain enough, that this Negative Interrogation of mine was no other than an Affirmation, Sir, this Captiousness discovers but your own Weakness. And whereas you say, I would have no Ceremony Impos'd, for which there is no Particular Rule in the Holy Scripture, there's never a word of it true. For First, 'Twas *Decency* and *Order* that I there mention'd, and not *Ceremony*, unless you will say that there is nothing *Decent* or *Orderly* in the Worship of God, but what lies in the *Ceremonies* that Men have dress'd it up with: Or that all those *Circumstantials* which naturally and necessarily conduce to the Decent and Orderly performance of it, are but *Ceremonies*, the contrary whereof I have already prov'd. Nor yet did I speak of *Particular Rules*, that were to be expected from the Holy Scriptures for these things; but

but that they give *General Directions*, which ought to determine us, as to what is Decent and Orderly. But to this Question, as you have thus distorted it, you have Four things to reply.

1. You say, *That it appears from what hath been said, that several Circumstances of Worship are left undetermined in the Holy Scriptures, which yet must some way be decided.* Now you speak of *Circumstances*, whereas the Question was of *Ceremonies*. How will you salve this Inconsistency? Or do you dream that *Circumstances* and *Ceremonies* are *Convertible Terms*? Sure tho' all *Ceremonies* be *Circumstances*, and in their own nature no more, if you do not Superstitiously make them Parts of *Worship*, yet all *Circumstances* are not *Ceremonies*. And then if by *Undetermined*, you mean, *not particularly determined*, I agree with you; but then the Particular determination of these *Circumstances* depends partly on the Nature of *Divine Worship*; and partly on the Providence of God, and the Various Conditions of Persons, Times, and Places; partly on the General Rules that are given in Scripture, and partly on the Prudence of Men, directed by a due Consideration and Application of these things, as may best subserve the Honour of God, and the proper Ends of *Divine Worship*.

2. To your Second thing I have said enough before, where you very mistakingly suppose that the *Apostles Prescrib'd and Enjoyn'd those several Ceremonious Rites and Usages, which are mention'd in some of their Epistles, tho' they only spake of them, as things then in common use, and did for the present bear with them, till they were afterward worn out of use, and justly laid aside as Scandalous.* But to lay aside some, and to set up others, is what we have no Apostolical Precept, or Precedent, nor any Reason for; unless it be to satisfy the Imposing Humours, or to serve the Private Interests of some Men,

3. *The*

3. *The reason why these things were laid aside, you say, is because matters of Ceremony are of so variable a Nature, that if they are decent in some Times and Places, they are not so in others.* So then, as long, and as far as they prove to be *Indecent*, I hope you will consent to the putting of them away. But then who shall be the Judges of the *Decency*? Those that devise and set them up, or find them to be for their Interest, be sure will not call them *Indecent*; *Dulcis Odor lucri ex requalibet.* But as for that which can prove its *Decency* from the nature of the thing, and that Spiritual Worship to which it is apply'd, so as that without it the Worship would be rude and *Indecent*, and which is *Decent* too in the Effects of it, let that pass for *Decent*; and when your Ceremonies have thus prov'd their *Decency*, we will own 'em for *Pretty, Decent, Innocent things*, but till then we think they ought to be laid aside, with the *Feasts of Love*, and the *Holy Kiss*, and the *Woman's Veil*, and the *putting off the Shoes*, and the rest of the Old Trinkets.

4. You proceed still on your false Supposition, *That the Apostles did give temporary Rules for Particular Ceremonies, and that therefore their Successors ought to do the like*; Whereas there is not one Rule to be found in all the New Testament, for the Enjoining of any one Ceremony, besides those *Sacred Sacramental ones* of our Lord's own Appointment, and that of the *Imposition of hands*, for which we have no particular Precept, but only *Apostolical Practice*; But many Precepts and Rules for the Abrogating of such as were then in use, and for the ridding of the Church of them, as fast as the Times would bear it. How idly then do you talk, in ascribing Disorder and Confusion to the want of those Ceremonies, which the notorious Experience of so many Ages have found to be the greatest Causes and Occasions of Disorder and Confusion?

4. You

4. You are griev'd for my making no more account of your Argument from the *Purity of your Ceremonies*; and because I told you it brought to my mind *Lot's* pleading for *Zoar*, *Is it not a Little one?* And here you run out a Parallel between *Lot's* Case and *Yours*, beyond what I could have thought would have been for your Honour or Interest. But, you say, *it was not said to Lot, you that now desire a Little City, may presently demand a greater, and having obtain'd one, you may petition for another, and therefore none shall be granted you*; This, you say, had been sutable to my way of reasoning, and to the Case in hand too. Thus you humbly state your Argument, as Precarious; and despairing of its force or merits, you fall a begging as *Lot* did for *Little Zoar*. How rightly doth the Apostle call them *Beggarly Elements*. 'Tis true, the smallness of the Request is sometimes an Argument with Charity, but this is not a Case wherein *Charity* is concern'd, but *Liberty and Property*; He that begs a little piece of my Bread, or of my Silver, *Charity* obliges me to grant, when I think there is real need; but he that asks, tho' but a Foot of my Land, is justly deny'd, lest by that he lay a Claim to more, to the wronging of my Posterity. Now I know no need the Church hath of these Ceremonies, for which you seem to make such Supplications, nor is it in my Power to grant away the *Liberty* our Lord hath purchased and intrusted us with, and which is his Churches *Inheritance*. And besides it hath appear'd by long Experience, that where an *Inch* hath been granted in this kind, an *Ell* hath soon after been taken. I cannot but wonder to hear a *Vind. p. 130.* Man of your reputed Sense, to say, *That this would cut out a way to the Dissolution of all Government.* Are these Unnecessary Ceremonies, or the Imposing Power you plead for, the *Basis* both of all Religion, and of all Government
in

in the World. What ! would the World shrink back again into its *Old Chaos*, or something worse, were it not for these little Devices of yours ? Are your *Ceremonies* indeed your God, that upholds all ? As for the Civil Government, how little is that interested in them ? Yea, might it not be as well, and much better without these *Make-bates* ? And for Church-Government, how vile, and trifling a Thing do you make it, in saying that the loss of a few Ceremonies is the way to dissolve it ? Would not that Reverend and Learned Prelate, the present Bishop of *Sarum*, (who perhaps the more he deserves, the less he be valued by some of you) find other, better, more noble and necessary Work for Church-Government, would you, but consult his *Pastoral Care*, than to trouble the World with these Useless Things, and to damn your *Protestant Brethren* for *Schismaticks*, for that they can't yield the required Obedience to 'em ?

The rest of your Comment on this Head is so impotently impertinent, that a Child may discern the vanity of it. You say, *That according to my Doctrine, If Governours enjoyn a Day of Fasting, (perhaps you mean such as Lent) or of Thanksgiving, (such as Easter) we must not comply with them, lest they should impose more. And if a Father requires something of his Children, with relation to their Apparel, they must not be obey'd, for fear of an Encroachment on their Liberty. And these,* you say, *are some of the Consequents of my Argument,* you should have said, these are the Vagaries of your own Brains. Because we cannot yield Obedience in things in their own Nature Unnecessary, and which in their Use appear to us to be Superstitious, and highly offensive to so great a part of the Church, in which we live, Doth it therefore follow, that we may deny our Obedience in any of those things, that are by all acknowledged to be absolutely, or

L

but

but occasionally, and relatively necessary, and any part of the Duty which we owe to our Maker, or to our Superiours? Or did you ever find us defective in these things? And as for the Case you have mention'd between *Fathers and Children*; What's this to the matters of God's Worship? Or dare you say, that Church-Governours have as Absolute a Despotick Power over the Worship of God, and the Consciences of Men, as Fathers have over the Bodies, or Vestments of their Children? This indeed is one strain above *High Church*.

5. You are angry with me for suggesting, that your Ceremonies are as *Nest-Eggs* to the rest of Popery; and that for the reception of Popery many have prepar'd their Nests. To which I reply; How well they deserve to be call'd *Nest-Eggs*, appears from Matter of Fact; Were not these the very Eggs that were left and taken out of that *Old Nest* of Popery, when the Protestant Reformation remov'd and brake the rest of them? Were not these very Ceremonies in that Church, and are they not there still? And from that of *Rome* were they taken into this of *England*. And tho' you say, That the Expectation of some monstrous Productions for One hundred and fifty years together hath still been frustrate; I could tell you to what this hath been owing: Not to your Principles, is clear; Nor to the Inclinations of the greater Part of what is call'd the *Church of England*, who have been ready and desirous enough of an *Accommodation with Rome*, would the Times have born it. 'Tis easy enough to discern what it is that we owe our Protestancy to. Not to mention the Instances of fresher Memory, it openly enough appear'd in Arch-Bishop *Laud's* time, how near these Eggs were come to be hatcht into a *Cokatrice* of the old Breed, had not a Divine Providence seasonably prevented it: Nor are they yet grown so *addle*, but that they are still as prolificous as ever. But what you so invidiously,

invidiously, so unreasonably and untruly upbraid us with, and call a *Servile Drudgery under the Jesuites*, I have already reply'd to.

Hence you proceed to tell us, in Vindication of your Ceremonies, *That they are not only few in number, but otherwise fit to be us'd, which, you say, may appear by the Rules according to which they are adapted, and which you have reduc'd to Three Heads.* Vind. p. 132.

1. You say, 'Tis requisite that there be some Conformity between them and the End, for which they are appointed; Nor is it always necessary for those that use them, to know the Reasonableness of their Institution. That the End for which your Ceremonies were Instituted, or at least Retain'd in the Church of England, was in Compliance with the Papists, hath been already prov'd, and how conform they are to that End, is evident enough: But as for the Reasonableness of it, that indeed is what passes our understanding; but that, it seems, is no great matter, it being to be supply'd by a *Blind Obedience*: And as for the Reasons of their first Institution, perhaps it is understood no more by the Common People in the Church of England, than it is in the Church of Rome. And to illustrate this your Doctrine, you give us an Instance of that Common Formality of *Kissing the Book in taking an Oath*, which few besides *Quakers* refuse, tho' they understand not the Original of that Ceremony, or how it came first into the World. But how Impertinent and Heterogene is this your Instance to the Things in Question? This, of *Kissing the Book*, is a Ceremony not properly Ecclesiastical, but Civil, and therefore administred by the Civil Magistrate; but the Question is about those Ceremonies, that are annex't to Church-Worship, to which that of taking an Oath doth not belong. Neither is it difficult for a very Ordinary Capacity to comprehend the

Sense of that Formality of *Kissing the Book*, tho' he never read or heard the History of its Original; yea, and some such Instituted Sign is in some respects necessary in the Publick Administration of an Oath, which cannot be truly said of those Common Acts of Worship, which we offer more immediately to God, in the Name of Jesus Christ.

2. The next Rule by which you measure the significancy and Decency of your Ceremonies, is *Custom, which, you say, gives Rules for Speaking, Actions, Habits, and Gestures. As by Custom, the putting off the Hat, Bowing and Kneeling, (to which you might have added Cringing, and making a Leg, and all the Antick Figures and Modish Forms of Compliment) are marks of Reverence amongst Men; so they are in our Addresses to God: And this indeed is the way to set up a Goodly Theatrical Worship in the Church; I wonder then how you presume to use the Words Thee and Thou in your Addresses to Almighty God, which Custom hath made a Mark of Rudeness, and Irreverence amongst Men. Unless you will condemn your selves, and say the Quakers are in the right on't.*

3. Your Third is but an *Apophysis* or *Protuberance* of your foregoing Rule; *That things, p. 134 which according to Custom, are signs of Irreverence amongst Men, are marks of Prophaneness and Contempt when they are us'd toward the Almighty. And here you think you very appositely referr us to Mal. 1. 8. If ye offer the blind for Sacrifice, is it not evil? If ye offer the lame and the sick, is it not evil? Offer it now to thy Governour, will he be pleas'd with thee, or accept thy Person, saith the Lord of Hosts. And this, you say, may afford us very useful Advice, (so indeed it may, if rightly understood and apply'd) for from hence (say you) it is clear, that if we rudely rush into his Presence, without any thing of Ceremony — we affront him in*
such

such behaviour as we would not use to our Governour. But doth the Prophet here speak of Ceremonies, or outward signs of Reverence? Not a word, but of *Offering the Blind, and the Lame, and the Sick, for Sacrifice*; that is, of abusing and cheating his Ministers of their Dues, which he had so strictly forbidden in his Law, and which you would be ready to call *Sacrilege*, which he says an Earthly Governour would take as an affront to be so dealt with. So that this Text is like to turn very little to your account. And as for the Gesture of *Kneeling in Prayer*, which is a Natural Indication of the Inward Reverence and Humility of the Heart, we approve of the Use of it as well as you, and practice it, where we can conveniently so do; but so, as not to place our Religion in it, or to use it as of Necessity, by vertue of any Divine Precept that we know for it; but use a Liberty in it, as you yourselves do. But of this I think I have already said enough, both in this, and in my *First Letter*.

You come next to consider more particularly the *Two Ceremonies of your Church, which, you say, have been most oppos'd by the Dissenters*, viz. *The Cross in Baptism, and Kneeling at the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper.* Page 136.

1. *The Sign of the Cross in Baptism.* What you reply to my *First Letter* on this Head is too frivolous to be repeated. I shall here only rejoyn some of those just Exceptions that are made against this Ceremony, and referr you to a *Discourse of Schism* lately written by that Learned Gentleman "Mr. Edward Polhill, who lived in full and Constant Communion with the Church of England, and was no frequenter of any of the Dissenters Meetings, and therefore cannot reasonably be suppos'd to be byass'd in their favour, as it is said in the Epistle to it. Here he says,

Polb. of Schism, "indeed us'd among the Ancient
p. 62, &c. "Fathers, but not without a Mix-

"ture of Superstition; of which he
gives particular Instances in *Tertullian, Cyprian,*
Origen, Ambrose, Athanasius, Chrysostome, Austin,
whose Superstition in this respect is inexcuseable,
and such as no true Protestants can allow.

2. "*The Sign of the Cross* is an Abominable Idol
"in the Popish Church, which cannot be deny'd,
"and therefore it cannot be retain'd in any Church,
"without some participation of the same guilt;
"but ought to be dealt with as the *Brazen Serpent*
"was, and no appearance of it tolerated in a Pro-
"testant Church.

3. "*The Sign of the Cross*, says he, in our own
"Church, tho' it be no *Idol*, yet is an *Image*, not a
"Graven Image, but a *Likeness* of Christ Crucify'd.
"Representation is the very Essence of an Image,
"and the Sign of the Cross is intended to Represent
"Christ Crucify'd: As the Sacraments are by God's
"Institution, Representative Images of Christ's
"Passion, so is the Cross by Man's. And what
"doth an Image do in God's Worship?

4. "*The Sign of the Cross* is an Addition to Bap-
"tism, and so utterly unwarrantable. Under the
"Old Testament it was unlawful to add to the
"Ceremonial Law of God, *Deut. 4. 2.* And how
"should it be Lawful under the New, to add to
"the Ceremonial Law of Christ? — An Addition
"to this is less tolerable than that, because the
"purer the Worship is, the more impure is the
"Addition. And that it is an Addition to Bap-
"tism, a Sign of Man's added to the Sign of Christ,
"cannot be deny'd.

5. "*The Sign of the Cross* is not meerly an Addi-
"on to Baptism, but it is a Mystical Teacher, and
"looks very like a Sacrament: As the Sacraments
"teach

“ teach Christ Crucify’d, by God’s Ordination, so
 “ doth the Cross by Man’s; Baptism is a Symbole
 “ of our Christian Profession, so is the Cross;
 “ Baptism hath a Word annexed to it, so hath the
 “ Cross; Baptism paints out Christ Crucify’d, so
 “ doth the Cross; Baptism enters the Baptized in-
 “ to the Church, so doth the Cross; Baptism dedi-
 “ cates the Infant unto Christ, so doth the Cross:
 “ And what is now wanting to make it a Sacra-
 “ ment? If you say Baptism conferrs Saving
 “ Grace, but the Cross doth not; do you but
 “ prove the First, and by the same Argument I will
 “ prove the Last. You may read the Author him-
 self more at large at your leisure.

2. The Other Ceremony you un- *Vind. p. 137.*
 dertake to defend, is *Kneeling at the*
Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. The Exceptions that
 I made against this in my *Letter*, you have reduc’d
 for me to these Two Heads.

1. You say that I condemn’d *Kneeling as Inconsist-*
ent with the first Institution of this Sacrament. But
 did you find the word *Inconsistent* in all my Discourse
 on that Argument? Why then did you devise it
 of your own head? I told you indeed that it was
 not agreeable to the Gesture of Christ and his Dis-
 ciples, in the First Institution of it, where all the
 Evangelists speak expressly of their *Sitting*, but of
Kneeling not one word. But this, you say, is a
heap of Errours, consisting of false Interpretations of
Scripture, and false Inferences from them, and good
for nothing but to deceive a meer English Reader, which
is a sort of Language very expressive of your Spi-
rit of Charity and Meekness; For, say you, upon
due Research, we shall find,

1. That it doth not appear from Scripture, that our
 Lord us’d the same Gesture at the Passover, and at the
 Institution of the Sacrament of his Body and Blood.
 Nor does St. Luke (if one will believe you) say a

word of it, or any thing tending that way, in the Places to which I referr'd you, which were, Luke 22. 14, 17, 18, 19, 20. Yet you confess that both Matthew and Mark express it so, as that both Ordinances, i. e. the Passover, and the Lord's Supper, made up but one Action, so that had St. Luke express'd it according to your Imagination, yet I have Two Witnesses to One against you. But to shew how wonderful a Critick you are, you fancy that you have found out that, which will reconcile them all to your Hypothesis; And what is that? Why, you say, this of Matthew and Mark is owing to the Translation; for the Greek ἐδόντων αὐτῶν may be render'd, When they had eaten, not When, or as they were eating. What pity was it you had not been one of the Translators of the Bible, or Supervisor of that Work: Pray, Sir, be not offended if I ask you, by what Rule of Grammar, or Authority, you will thus turn the Present into a Præter Tense? Doth not ἐδόντων αὐτῶν denote the Present time only, *Edentibus illis*, or *inter Edendum*? How then can you make it to signify the time past? For the Greek word, as great a Critick as you are in that Language, will not bear it. But, you say, that it ought to be so, is manifest from Luke 22. 20. and 1 Cor. 11. 25. Where we find, that it was after the Paschal Supper; or in the close of that Supper, that the Lord instituted his own. What a rare Discovery have you made us here! Who ever doubted but that our Lord did first eat of the Paschal Supper, before he Instituted that of the Bread and Wine Only? But doth that prove, and make it manifest, as you say, that it was not done at the same Sitting, any more than that there may not be a First, and a Second-Course at the same Meal? Ay! but you say, it is also observable, that before the Administration of the Bread and Wine, he gave thanks; and doubtless he did this in a Posture of Reverence: Ay, doubtless he did it Reverently,

verently, but who ever told you that he did it *Kneeling*? Or is there no other Gesture Reverent in this case, but *Kneeling*? And may I not ask you, is this your Gesture when-ever you say Grace before and after Meat? If it be, you are very singular; if it be not, you censure your self, as very Irreverent. I fancy that your endeavouring to Criticize, hath but disorder'd your Intellect, and left you in a Cloud. Nay, should we suppose that the Supper which Christ was said to rise from, *John* 13. 4. when he went to wash his Disciples feet, was the *Paschal Supper*, which few of the best Interpreters will allow, but think that it was a *Common Supper*, which the *Jews* us'd as *Preparative* to the *Passover*, yet after he had washed their feet, and girded on his Garments, it is expressly said, that he *Sat down again* before he eat of his other Supper, and therefore did eat it *Sitting* with his Disciples, *ver.* 12. Hence I conclude, that till you can make it manifest, that our Lord used different Gestures at the *Passover*, and at the *Sacrament of his Body and Blood*, and what these different Gestures were, it appears by all that we can find in the New Testament, that they were the very same. But, you say, our Lord did eat the *Paschal Supper* before he Instituted that of his *Body and Blood*. Erg. his Gesture was not the same in both. Indeed I have all along found you an Extraordinary Man at Conclusions, for let the Premises be what they will, the Conclusion is sure to be your own.

2. You say further, That if our Saviour p. 139. and his Disciples did use the same Gesture at the *Passover*, and at the *Sacrament of his Body and Blood*, it was not *Sitting*: So that if the first fail, you have yet another String to your Bow. Nor, say you, do the Places which I have cited from the *Evangelists* affirm it was. And here again you shew your dislike of the Translation, and how much you will

will please to allow us, as a true *Translation* of our *Bibles*, I cannot tell, but wish you would once bless the Church with your more accurate *Edition*, that we may know what to believe of them. It seems the Learned Men concern'd in both the *Translations* now commonly extant, *viz.* of *Queen Elizabeth*, and *King James*, thought it fittest to translate the words, *Sitting*, and not *Discumbing*, or *Lying*, or *Falling down*, as you would have it, and I think they had as Wise Reasons for their *Translation*, as you can pretend to for yours: For what tho' their *Sitting down at Meat*, was not, in those Times and Countries, exactly the same Gesture in Figure of Body, with that which is the Fashion of our own Country in *Sitting at Table*, doth that alter the Nature, or End of the thing? And why then should it alter the Name of it? The *Greeks* and *Romans* of old, and many other Countries of the World at this day, have a different way and mode of *Sitting to eat at their Tables*, but must it not therefore be call'd *Sitting*, but that only which you please so to call? Let every Country sit after its own Fashion, this is certain, as they us'd to sit at their Common Meals, so they sat here, which was their *Eating*, not their *Praying*, or *Adoring Gesture*, which is the thing now in Question between us. So that you are never the nearer *Kneeling*, i. e. the *Worshipping Gesture*, for any thing you have yet said, while the strength of your Argument, that their Gesture was not *Sitting* lies in this; that it was not *Sitting* after the *English Mode*. How glorious then is your Triumph, when you so unjustly endeavour to retort my own Words upon me.

Now tho' we do not think, that by this Example of our Saviour, we are strictly oblig'd to the same Gesture in this Sacrament, but that it may be done as acceptably, and to as good Effect, either *Sitting*, or *Recumbing*, or *Kneeling*, or *Lying all along*, according

according as particular Cases may necessarily require ; yet a Liberty being herein granted us, we cannot, without Superstition, be bound to this, or that ; but as we ought to avoid Irreverence on the one hand, so we are equally bound to avoid all appearance of *Idolatry* and *Superstition* on the other. For the *Ordinary Table-Gesture*, we have our Saviour's own Example in its first Institution, which is enough to justify it : But for the *Praying Posture*, which both in its Nature and End, is so opposite to it, we have no Warrant ; but being by Men impos'd as necessary, is plainly Superstitious, *i. e.* *Super statutum*. And because you are pleas'd to deride us with these Idle Questions ; *Why we do not as well exchange the Sacramental Wine, for Ordinary Table-Drink ?* I answer, because Wine is not a *Circumstance*, but the *Instituted Matter* and *Element* of this Sacrament : Nor do we partake of it with our *Hats on*, because we find that this is an Irreverence expressly condemn'd by the Apostle in Acts of Solemn Worship ; and when you can shew us out of the New Testament as much as this comes to for *Kneeling*, then will we *Kneel* too.

3. You say, *That if the Gesture of Christ at the Institution of the Sacrament had been Sitting, he design'd it not as a Law or Pattern to all succeeding Times ; and your Reason is, because he hath not reveal'd it to us : None of the Evangelists, nor St. Paul, hath said a word of it, therefore it is to us as if it had never been, and the Imposing of it as a Necessary Duty, is adding to the Word of God, and a teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.* Very good ; Yet to say that none of the *Evangelists* have said a word of *Sitting* at the Institution of this Sacrament, when they all speak it expressly, and with one mouth, is a little too *Broad* : And to say, that this Example doth not amount to a *Rule* or *Pattern* in this case, as the like must be granted to do in some others, with

with the exception of Extraordinary cases of Necessity, is too Bold. But if the *Imposing of a thing as a Necessary Duty*, (which yet is not our Case) for which we have neither Command nor Pattern, nor one Word to warrant it in all the Book of God, be an Adding to the Word of God, and a Teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men, then have you said as much as is needful to be said, not only against *Kneeling* at this Sacrament, but against all your other *uninstituted Ceremonies and Forms of Worship*, which you would impose on us as necessary Duty. And that our Saviour doth, now that he is in Heaven, expect another way of Address and Deportment from us in this Ordinance, than he did while he was with his Disciples in the Flesh, is what you ought to have prov'd, before you had so boldly asserted it; and what that way of Address is that he now expects, and how you came to know so much of his mind beyond all other Men, or when, and how did he discover this to you? We expect to be better satisfy'd of the Truth of this *Enthusiasm*, before we can give you the Credit or Obedience you demand of us. Sir, had these words dropt from the Pen of a Profess'd Papist, I should not have wonder'd at all at the Design of them.

II. The other Objection we have against *Kneeling* in the Act of Receiving this Sacrament, is this, That it is become Scandalous (at least to very many) because it Symbolizes with the Idolatry of the Church of Rome in Worshipping the Host. But against this you have Four things to say.

1. That we do as much Symbolize with the Socinians in Sitting, as you do with the Church of Rome in Kneeling. Where those People now live that are of a Stated Socinian Communion, distinct from all others, I cannot tell (unless you mean the Quakers) But if all those that are of the Socinian Perswasion, do Communicate in this Ordinance Sitting, I have reasons

reasons to think that very many of your *Church of England* do so Communicate, and that both of the Clergy and Others. But whether they receive it *Sitting* or *Kneeling*, this was never made the *χαρακτηριστικόν*, or Mark of their owning that Heresy; therefore you might as pertinently have instanc'd in any thing else, wherein they agree in Practice with the Orthodox: But it is notoriously known, that the *Church of Rome* doth require this Ceremony as an Act of Religious Worship to the real Presence in the Host: Wherefore how different soever your Principles or Profession be, you agree in the same Outward Act with them, and consequently in a Semblance of the same Idolatry, which ought not to be, unless it had been a Matter of express Command from God, which alone is, in such a case, able to sanctify, and make it acceptable. How full is the Word of God of the strictest Precepts and Cautions against Symbolizing with the Manners and Fashions of Idolaters; *not to do after the Customs of the Heathens, nor once to make mention of their Gods*. Was it enough for them to have said, that they did not Worship the gods of the Heathen, but the true God, in those Ways, and with those Ceremonies which they thought would be more for the Honour of the God, whom they worshiped? Do not the *Papists* say the same? And is not this the very Argument by which you endeavour to justify all your Uninstituted Significant Ceremonies? Indeed were the Ceremony of Divine Institution, all the Idolatry in the World would not justify our laying it aside; but it being but of Humane Appointment, and also defil'd by an Idolatrous use, all the Excuses you can make for it will not justify your Retaining it.

2. You demand, *Who they are that say this Gesture was introduc'd and impos'd to support the Bloody Doctrine of the Real Presence; and who they are that think*

think it was the Occasion of that Idolatry. This you pretend to enquire after, that you may fling a little of your Dirt at them ; but if you are ignorant who they are, so you are like to be for me. The Answer of such a Question is not like to signify much in this matter ; it being notoriously known what use the *Church of Rome* hath made of it ; and whether it were the Occasion, or the Consequent, of that Idolatrous Tenet, is no great odds ; the relation it hath to the Idolatry, is enough to make it an Abomination to us who are Protestants.

3. You say, *That if this Gesture hath an Appearance of Evil, it is to the Dissenters, and not to you.* No, Sir, Charity prompts us to hope, that to you it appears an Innocent, Harmless thing ; but if it appear otherwise to us, this ought to be a Rule to us, tho' we pretend not to obtrude it, as a Rule to you. You say, *we would draw you into Schism, a real and grievous Evil, out of fear of a shadow of Evil which we have rais'd in our own Imaginations.* But where lies the Reason, the Justice, or the Truth of this Complaint ? What have we done, or offer to do, to draw you into Schism, or any other Sin ? Hath our Faithfulness to our own Consciences, and our necessary Self-defence, when thus provok'd to it by you, rais'd these Storms against us, and made you to damn us for Schismatics ? We can't help that. What have we desir'd of you, but that you would walk with us by the Apostle's Rule, *Rom. 14.* Would it be a Schism, a real and grievous evil, to bear with us as Brethren, notwithstanding a few Ceremonial Differences ? And will you accuse the Government too of Sin, and drawing you into Schism, for granting us the Liberty we enjoy ?

To how little purpose too have you gone about to restrain the Sense of that Text, *1 Thes. 5. 22. Abstain from all appearance of evil ?* Who, that knows any thing in that Language, knows not that

that *id est ab id est video*, more properly, and usually, signifies an *Appearance*, *Form*, or *Likeness*, than a *Sort*, or *Kind* of a thing, tho' it be sometimes so us'd? And in this Text, tho' we grant that the Apostle dehorts from every *Kind* of evil, yet not only so, but from every thing that hath the *Appearance*, the *Shew*, or *Suspicion* of Evil in it. Yea, tho' it be really but an Evil in Appearance, yet to him to whom it so appears, it is equivalent to Real, and ought to be abstain'd from (as far as it consists with what appears to be plain Duty, in other respects,) so that no one hath need to run into a *Real Evil* to avoid an *Imaginary one*, as some are apt to do, or to censure others for doing, who call Evil Good, and Good Evil.

4. Your last Effort on this Head is but another of your wild and abusive *Rhodomontado's* on a wilful Mistake and Wrest of my Page 144. Words. I had said, that your Churches declaring against the *Romish* Idolatrous Use of *Kneeling* in this Sacrament, is not enough to purge, or to defend it, unless it were a matter of particular Divine Institution: And which I think still, I had very just reason to say. For if the Declaring against the Idolatry of a thing, be sufficient to justify the use of it, then may all the Idolatries that ever were in the Church of God in the World, while they declar'd to worship the true God, tho' after the manner of the Idolatrous Heathen, be justify'd too. If *Kneeling* before the Elements be not Idolatrous, because you intend no such thing in it, but use it as a Gesture of Reverence, may you not on the same pretence, use the *Crucifixes*, and *Images*, and the other *Instruments* of Popish Idolatry, declaring, as the *Papists* do, that you do not Worship any of these, but use 'em as *Necessary Helps* to your Devotion. And this was what I there said, That these Declarations are not sufficient to purge it from

from the Idolatry that cleaves to it. 'Tis true, while it was us'd only as a supposed necessary Gesture of Reverence, it was but a Superstition, an unrequired Act of Will-worship and Humility; but since it hath been so Idolatrously abus'd in the Church of Rome, it is now something worse than bare Superstition. But you say, *That I condemn a considerable Body of Men, under whose Government we live, as not worthy to be believ'd in a matter of Religion; of which I spake not a word, nor any thing like it, but the quite contrary.* What is there to be found in my words, or to be extorted from them, by any one that pretends to a Sobriety of Sense, that doth import, tho' but by an innuendo, *That these Men are not worthy to be believ'd, when they declare their abhorrence of all Idolatrous Thoughts and Pretensions in the use of that Gesture?* Yea, I do not question the Sincerity of their Abhorrence, but only its Sufficiency to justify the Action. Nor did I censure any, that were otherwise perswaded, and satisfied in their minds, for their acting according to their present Perswasions; tho' you here so invidiously presume to tell the World,

Page 145. *That it was the Dissenters only that I had thus excus'd, but had excluded the Church of England from Purgation:* Which Suggestion of yours I despise, as coming from beneath *ἐκ τῆς συνόλου*.

II. The Second Reason which you assign for our preferring the way of the Separation before that of Conformity is, *That it affords us Communion with a better People.* What I reply'd to this, is to be seen in my Letter, which you are pleas'd to say, is pretty modest, but that I have not much of the sort. For you seem to be highly offended, and call it *Investive*, when I had so just an occasion to mention the Ignorant and Scandalous ones of your Clergy, which is too notorious and obvious to be deny'd; and that such of the Laity as are of the same Com-
pletion;

plection; and immoral Conversation; or most grossly Ignorant of the very Nature and First Principles of Religion, are admitted, yea, pressed to come to the Lord's Table with them; *This, you say, is not to be believ'd, tho' there be so many Thousand Eye-witnesses all over the Land to attest it. But, forsooth, it is not probable, because you have a Form of Words in your Office of the Communion, cautioning Blasphemers, Hinderers, or Slandervers of God's Word, Adulterers, such as are in Malice, Envy, or any grievous Crime, from Coming, and exhorting them to Repentance; which, without any farther Care or Exercise of Discipline, must needs be an effectual means to secure this Sacred Mystery from Prophanation or Contempt. But no want of Discipline, you say, will justify a Separation; and you went about to prove it by an instance in the Church of Corinth, which I have already answer'd in my First Letter p. 93. and shall add no more here, but this one word, That when the Necessary Reformation cannot be otherwise obtain'd, then is Separation just and necessary, which was the Case between the Church of England and that of Rome, when we first separated from its Communion; and which is Ours now.*

III. The third and last Reason that you allow us is this, *That we find the way which we have chosen, to be the more Edifying, or, in your own Phrase, more proper and successful to advance us in Spiritual Good.* And this is one of the Reasons which we own, and will vindicate.

But to this you oppose your Notion of Edification, which as you apply it, is not to us very Edifying; and that for these Three Reasons.

1. Because you restrain your Notion of Edification to the Transitive Acceptation of it, as if to Edify were only to build up others, and not ourselves. I grant that the Edifying of others, in the
M Sense

Sense as you propose it, in order to the advantage of the whole Church, is every Christian's Duty; but that any one is bound to love his Neighbour better than himself, or to seek the Good of others, to the ruin or hazard of his own Soul, is so unnatural a Doctrine, that it is not like to obtain with any that have but a tolerably right *Idea* of an Eternal State: Nay, this would be in some respects a more barbarous piece of Inhumanity, than the *Sacrifices of the Valley of Ben-hinnom*, and altogether as unacceptable to God.

2. Because your Notion of Edification excludes all from being the Church of Christ, or any parts of it, that are not fully of your own Communion; but if we are Christians, and any part of the Church, we ought to be edify'd, as well as you. And tho' every individual Believer be call'd the *Temple* of the *Holy Ghost*, and therefore thought that the *Temple* might claim a right to being edified as well as the *Church*; yet you tell us, these are not to be edify'd or advanc'd in any Spiritual Good, which is your *Periphrasis* of Edification, because 'tis the *Body only*, i. e. the Natural Body, that is the *Temple of the Holy Ghost*: But then pray tell us, how or after what manner is it, that the Holy Ghost doth dwell in these *Bodies*, as they are meer *Natural Bodies*? What! Is it by a kind of *Possession*, or some other unconceivable way, like that of *Transubstantiation*? Sure this Notion of yours is very New, to say no worse of it.

3. Because you place the whole of Edification in a Conformity to your Rites and Ceremonies; as if without these it were impossible for the Church to be edified. Is not this to set the Traditions of Men above the Ordinances of God, and to ascribe all the Life and saving Efficacy of Religion, to the things of your own Invention? And if it be true, as indeed it is, *That to divide the Church, and to bring*

bring into it *Disorder and Confusion*, is not the way to edifice it; Why then do you, for the sake of these Unnecessary and Offensive things, thus divide and disorder it? For if I have not already said enough to convince any capable and unbiass'd Judgment, that 'tis you that are the Dividers of the Church, and not we, who cannot, without sinning against our own Souls, conform to them, I hope I shall, before I yet dismiss these Papers.

And now we are come to the two last things you have to speak to on this subject, viz. *Praying and Preaching*, as tending to Edification.

1. You begin with *the Way of Praying*, which is used in our Meetings. But here Page 154. I find nothing of any moment added to what was before said and answered. Only give me leave now calmly to tell you, what I grant, and what I dislike in this part of your Discourse, that the Difference between us may not seem to be greater than in truth it is.

1. Then I grant, that Forms of Prayer are in themselves Lawful, and in some cases Expedient, whether in Private, or in Publick; that is, to those that either want an Ability to express themselves in Prayer without a Form, or are apt to vent their own Errors, or Indecencies in that Duty, to the corrupting of the Doctrine, or the exposing of this Ordinance of the Gospel to contempt, which was the case of the Church, when, under *Constantine*, it first became *National*, and also when here in *England* it became *Protestant*. In that juncture, before abler Ministers could be provided, which could not be done suddenly, for so great a Body of People, that had been bred up in the Blindness of Popery; The Protestant *Liturgies* and *Homilies* were then of good use, as Dr. *Beveridge* hath observ'd: But these things were but for the then present Exigence, nor any otherwise design'd by some

of the Greatest and Best of our Reformers. And as the Gift of *Preaching*, which hath by God's Blessing on Mens diligence, been since acquir'd, hath long ago superseded the need, and the use of the *Homilies*, so it might and ought to have done in the Gift of *Prayer*, but this being the more Spiritual Exercise, is that which Men are generally more averse to.

2. I grant that Mens Abilities to express themselves in Prayer to God, with Matter, Method and Words, agreeable to all particular Emergencies and Occasions, is but a Gift, which is common both to the Good and the Bad, the Sincere and the Hypocrite, and therefore cannot, singly consider'd, be a true Mark of Saving Grace, or conclusive of the Special Assistance of the Spirit of God in that Duty. The veriest Hypocrite in the World may attain to as eminent a measure of this, as of any other common Gift, and be able, with a wonderful clearness and readiness of Thought and Expression, to adapt matter to every part of Prayer on all particular Occasions, and with a *Decorum* becoming so Sacred and important an Ordinance, to the Spiritual Benefit of others, as the most eminent Saint may do, tho' he be all the while but as *Sounding Brass*, and the Duty be to himself unprofitable.

3. I grant that it is not only Ignorant, but Impious, to think that the Holy Unchangeable God is wrought upon, or delighted with the meer Novelty of Expressions, or with Tones, or Accents of Voice, or the Variation of Phrases, or the Modulations of them. And I hope your Christian Charity will prompt you to believe, that we have other thoughts of that Immense Deity, whom we Worship; neither can your exacter Composures commend us to God any more than these, nor is there any part of your Exprobrations that recoils upon you more than this.

4. I grant too, that the Gift of Prayer hath been as much abus'd, as any one Gift whatsoever; nor perhaps is there any other that gives the Devil a greater advantage to puff Men up with. Yea, this I think may be stated for a general Observation, that the more Spiritual any Duty is in it self, the greater Temptations it is attended with, both from the Flesh and from the Devil, and the greater Mischiefs may be done by it; *Corruptio optimi est pessima*. Yet notwithstanding all this, there are some things that I have reason to dislike in your Discourses on this Subject; as

1. Because from the Abuse of this Gift of Prayer, you argue against the Use of it, which ought not to be admitted in this, nor in any other Case, unless you will argue against the use of every good thing in the World, and as much against your own Forms of Prayer as any, which have been as grossly and as generally abus'd, as that you libel us for.

2. Because you are no more cautious in reflecting the Abuses of this Gift of Prayer on such as are not guilty, and discouraging those, who in their Simplicity, pour out their Souls to God for Spiritual or Temporal good things, in Confessions, Supplications or Thanksgivings, according to the inward Sense they have upon their own Hearts, and that measure of Understanding they have attain'd to. When you seem to suggest, that when they feel such Motions within them, as bear a resemblance of true Devotion, and do not impute it to Natural Causes, or suspect an evil Spirit in them, by which they may be thus acted, as some of the worst of Men have sometimes been, they are under a Delusion, and please themselves with Dreams; whereby you are in danger of wronging the Innocent, and, which is worse, of Blaspheming that Holy Spirit by which, for ought you know, they are acted. I never design'd to plead for the Wicked,

but you very rashly condemn the Righteous with the Wicked, in exclaiming on the thing for the sake of such as have abus'd it, which is very Unjust, and prophanely Irreligious.

3. Because you seem not to consider what the proper use of words in Prayer is; tho' their end be not to inform Omniscience, or to move Him, who is God and changeth not, nor subject to like Affections and Passions as we are: And tho' their end be not meerly to please the Ear, or to gratifie the Fancy or Imagination, yet are they of great and very necessary use, both to the Persons praying, and to those that joyn in the Duty. To the Persons Praying, as they are the Means by which the Soul doth disburden it self before God; For by the Lips the Heart doth naturally ease it self, *Psal.* 39. 2, 3. and gives vent to its Affections, when under great Concern; and which cannot well be done without the use of words, either Mental or Vocal; And according as the Heart is affected, so are the words uttered, both for Matter, and suitable Degree of Fervour and Enlargedness. And to the Persons that joyn in the Duty, wherein it is not fit, tho' naturally too apt, to be cold, customary and lukewarm: Therefore he that Prays, as the Mouth of others, ought so to express himself both in Words and Affections, as may be proper to convince the Conscience, to awaken the Devotion, and to warm the Affections of those, with and for whom he prays, that he may instrumentally beget in them a Frame of Spirit suitable to the Spirituality of the Duty, and the Importance of it. And this we may not expect shall be done by immediate Impulses, or Supernatural Influences, but by those natural means, which are proper to beget it in a Natural and Regular way, and wherein, if the Heart be sincere, the Spirit of God hath promised its Assistances; And by this means

means it becomes a true and sanctify'd Devotion, and accepted of God; *The Spirit suaviter deus, helping together with our Infirmities.* But now the more Excellent this Gift is in him that prays, the properer it is to produce this natural and good Effect; but which Excellency lies not in Tones or Modulations of Voice, at least such as are Artificial and Affected, but in a readiness and plenty of such matter, as is apt to work on the nobler Faculties of the Soul, and utter'd too with that Seriousness, Gravity and Life, as is naturally productive of the like Impressions on the Minds of others. *Si vis me flere dolendum est*

Primum ipsi tibi. Iron sharpneth Iron, *Hor. de Art. Poetic.*
So a Man sharpneth the Countenance of his Friend, Prov. 27. 17. And to this

end we find, that the Gift of Prayer, rightly exercis'd, is much more proper, than the continual repeating of one and the same Form of words. But if you find it otherwise with your self, I know not who is about to censure you for acting according to your Experience. And as for those that have not attain'd to such a Competency of this Gift, as to secure the Honour of Religion in these Publick Ministrations, let them, for me, be either dismiss'd, or suspended, or else confin'd to a good Form prepar'd for them. And herein I speak no other than the Sense of a very many of the Greatest and the Wisest of the Church of England, both Ancient and Modern, as *Sandys, Wilkins.*

But then you are offended with me for telling you, that one cause of Mens unreadiness in this Gift of Prayer, *So that those that joyn with them in the Duty, may, as you said, be in pain or fear about the next words that may fall from them,* was their not accustoming their Tongues to Holy Discourse, or their not studying their own Hearts as they ought

to do; as if I had reflected this on all those that pray by Forms, which scarce any one, but your self, would have charg'd me with; yet, that there are too many such in the Clergy of the Church of England, is too notorious to be deny'd. And for this you promise to give me Correction; and that with this Threefold Whip.

1. You say, *There are many Persons of great Piety, and an Exemplary Conversation, who from natural Infirmary, or for other reasons (which is very seasonably and comprehensively added) have a great imperfection of utterance, and yet in nobler Qualifications excel others.* Whether you intend your self for one of this sort, I cannot tell; but *Moses*, it seems, was one of them, because out of his superabundant Modesty, or else only to have excus'd himself from that Work, he complain'd, that he was not *Eloquent* enough for such an Embassy to *Pharaoh*, but was *slow of Speech*; Whether his Tongue were apt sometimes to Stammer, or else he was a little afraid to appear before *Pharaoh*, for a reason that he was privy to, is uncertain, it seems he was doubtful of himself, and therefore made t his Excuse, that he was not *Eloquent*; but that he wanted the *Gift of Prayer*, and not able to express himself to God, without a Form prepar'd for him, is what I think never enter'd into any ones head but yours. No doubt then 'twas *Aaron* the Priest that compos'd all his Prayers for him, and particularly that of *Exodus* 32. 31, 32. and all the rest of those Forms of Prayer and Praise, that on any occasion he made use of: And yet this *Moses* is recorded in Scripture for one of the most *Powerful Intercessors with God*, that ever liv'd in the World, *Jer.* 15. 1. *A Man learned in all the Wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in Words and in Deeds,* *Acts* 7. 22. and several parts of the Old Testament, besides the *Pentateuch* ascrib'd to him, as
the

the Author and Composer. Now, that this Man of God, with whom the Lord spake face to face, as a Man speaketh to his Friend, Exod. 33. 11. should be so unhappy as, to the Gift of Prayer, that he who was to Aaron instead of God, must be beholden to Aaron, or to any other, for a Form to Pray by, is most unaccountably strange.

2. You say, *Persons may have a great readiness in Prayer, that are Strangers to a true Sense of Religion.* What a rare Discovery is this, of what no body ever deny'd? And for one Instance you might have brought an hundred, and not have gone out of your own Church for them: But what then? *Ergo.* It is not for want of Mens accustoming their Tongues to Holy Discourses, and studying their own Hearts, that they so fail in the Gift of Prayer. Very Logically concluded.

3. You tell me, *There have been some amongst us, tho', to do us right, you will not say, of us, who have been thought Eminent for what they call the Gift of Prayer, who might have made one tremble to bear in what manner they made their Address to Heaven.* For which you instance in some of Oliver Cromwell's Chaplains. What the manner of their Addresses to Heaven was, I cannot tell, neither can you, but by hear-say, and that from none of their best Friends: But however they made their Addresses, it seems they were mistaken in their Confidence of the Success of their Prayers; And this, no doubt, they got, by their presuming to pray without a Form of some good Bishop's preparing for them. And now, Sir, by these your Corrections, I am like to receive very little Instruction.

But that the same Reasons are as Cogent p. 161. for *Homilies*, as for *Liturgies*, you deny. Both because there is more reason we should know before Prayer, what Requests we shall put up, that so we may the more heartily joyn in them without hesitation, than that

that we should know before Sermon what Instruction we shall receive in it, for this, say you, we may examine afterward by the Rule of Scripture. But as far as Prayer is Instructive, which is one End of it, as well as of Sermons, so the Case is the same. And as for the General Matter of Prayer, it is known before hand, much more than that of a Sermon, tho' the very Words and Expressions be not particularly known; neither is the Matter of Prayer wont to be so difficult, but that an Ordinary Understanding that attends to what is said, may on the first hearing it, discover whether he may say *Amen* to it, or no; or if the Matter be doubtful, the danger to the Hearer can be no greater in Prayer than in Preaching. But besides, you say, *That out of Reverence to the Divine Majesty, and to maintain the Dignity of Religion in the Publick Worship; it is requisite that we be more careful of what we offer up to God, than of what we speak to our Fellow-Creatures.* As if the Dignity of Religion did consist in Forms and Ceremonies; or as if there may not be as great a Care taken, yea, and ordinarily a far greater, in what we offer to God from the Altars of our own Hearts, especially being enlightened and enlivened by the Word and Spirit of God, than what we offer out of a Book that lies before our Eyes. Yea, and why must we be more careful of what we offer up to God from our Selves, than of what we speak to our Fellow-Creatures from God, in his Name, and as his Word? Unless you will say that what we Preach to our Fellow-Creatures, are but the words of our own devising, and in matters of our own Concern only, wherein we speak not as his Messengers, but as our own Agents, which perhaps may be too true of some, that do but make a Private Trade, and a Livelihood of their Sacred Office, and care not with what the People are fed, so that Themselves may grow fat,
and

and the base design of their Covetousness, Ambition, or Popular Praise be serv'd. And if this be your mind, your Argument is proper enough.

But then after all this Garboil, you confess, *That those that have the Gift of Elocution, which is the best name you can give the Gift of Prayer, may upon Occasion express the Matter of Prayer in futable Terms, and be of some benefit to others:*

See more to this purpose in the Answer to Dr. Scot concerning Forms of Prayer.

For which Sweetness of yours, I do not think that you deserve our thanks. *But, say you, if they put too high a value upon this, and if it brings them into a contempt of all Liturgies, that is, if they adore not your Great Diana, what they take to be their Peculiar Priviledge becomes a dangerous snare to 'em, and instead of promoting cannot but hinder their Edification.* 'Tis true indeed, to put too high a value upon Gifts, or any thing else that is of our own, whether Gifts or Forms, is not the way to Edification, wherefore we are all concern'd to be by so much the more watchful in this matter.

II. Your next Enquiry is, *Whether the Way of Preaching in our Meetings ought to be prefer'd before that which is us'd in the Churches?* But here I find nothing that is worth the repeating. Yet I must take notice of your great anger for my charging some of your Clergy with such a way of Preaching, as is very little to the Edification of their People, and such a manner of Living, as destroy'd the Ends of their Ministry. This I did not affirm of them all, but that it is true of the greater part of such as serve in Country Parishes, is too evident to be deny'd by any that is but a Competent Judge of these things. But in defence of your Clergy, you tell us, *That what sort of Sermons are Preach'd in your Churches, may in a great measure appear by the very many that the Conforming Clergy have Published to the world.*

World. But how rare it is to meet with these good Sermons, I believe others do find as well as I, except it be now and then a Railing Visitation Sermon, by one or other of your Finer Sort of Tongues. 'Tis true, Dr. Tillotson and some few others of your more Moderate and Learned Churchmen, have very useful and excellent Sermons in Print; and if the greater part of your Country-Clergy would but take these Sermons, and read them to their People, it might conduce much more to their Edification, than what they bring of their own into their Pulpits. These indeed give good Patterns to others, and shew them what their Sermons should be, but to say that therefore they are such, or any way like them, is a Consequence much like several others that I have already met with in this your Discourse, and Defence. Yet if this would amount to any thing like Demonstration, or but probable Argument, I suppose I might produce more than Ten of our Printed Sermons to one of yours; by which it may as evidently appear what sort of Sermons are Preach'd in our Churches. As for what Mr. Baxter has said of your Reverend, Solid, Worthy Preachers of the City of London, I heartily agree with him in it, and have always had an honourable esteem of all that I find of this Character in the Church of England. But what you have pickt up from such as have spoken their own Prejudices against us, or perhaps intended it only of the

* It is observable that Dr. Crisp the great Antinomian, Lived and Died in the Communion of the Church of England.

* Crispians, or Antinomians, whose Doctrine we abhor as much as you, I do not take my self much concern'd in. 'Tis a very rare thing for a Man to meet with a Sermon, or any other Religious Discourse, so cautiously and accurately compos'd, or deliver'd, which if one would allow in himself a Foolish, Captious, Satyrical, Ridiculing humour,

humour, he might not, one way or other find occasions to expose. And now having left me no more to do on this Section, I shall follow you to the Next.

Sett. V.

The general Design whereof seems to be but this, *viz.* To wipe your self as clean as you can, from the Foulness of those Consequences which I drew from that Guilt of Schism, wherewith you had charg'd us in the highest degree, and which you loaded with all the Aggravations you could gather from your own Invention, or from any Authors Ancient, or Modern ; whereby you cut us off from any Union with Christ the Head, or with his Catholick Church upon Earth, and consequently from all hope of Salvation, and represented us as worse than Murderers, or Idolaters, (that is, at a greater distance from you than the Papists) and such as could not lawfully claim any Protection from the Government, under which we live, so that we are plainly outlaw'd by you, as far as you can do it : And was not this enough to justify the Consequences that I charg'd you with in my *Letter* ? But a little to mitigate the Rigour of all this, you are now pleas'd to tell us,

1. *That Schism is indeed a heinous Sin, as appears both from the Nature of it, and from the Testimony of Ancient and Latter Authors, of which you mention some.* And indeed I think so too, could we but once be agreed on whose side the Schism lies. The Passions which the Fathers of the Primitive Churches shew'd against the Schismatical Separations of some of their Presbyters, had much more to be said in their Justification, than can in our Case be pretended to, not only for that their Separations were more Causeless, and grounded on ill Principles and bad Ends, and attended with some gross Errours in

in Doctrine, but for that they were not, under the present Circumstances of their Relation to their Ordinary, *sui juris*, but under the Despotical Power of their Chief Pastor, or Bishop, as hath been already said, which is not the case now, since the Pastoral Office is distributed to the Presbyters in their respective Charges; which being not duly consider'd, hath been the Ground of many of your great Mistakes.

II. You say, *If Schism be a grievous Sin, it doth not follow that all the Dissenters (supposing them guilty of it) are grievous Criminals; for in particular Persons there may be several Circumstances that may abate the malignity of it.* So that, such is your Clemency, you are not for Executing of all without exception; that would look worse than Judge Jefferys, but the Ring-leaders, among whom doubtless you reckon me, with the Rest of my Order, may expect no more pity with you, than the Dogs you compare us to, from *Phil. 3. 2.*

III. You pretend, *You had no more design to engage Secular Princes against us, or to inflict Temporal Punishments on us, or to fill the Prisons with us, than St. Paul, or Clemens, or Ignatius, or Irenæus, or Cyprian had, who employ'd their Power against the Sectaries of their Times, and therefore you think you should be as excusable as they, who have form'd your Discourse upon their Model.* But what doth this little Stroaking signify? Is it not apparent enough what your Design was, by your Envyng us the Liberty that is by Law granted us, and your endeavouring to cut us off from the benefit of that Law, unless you will still say, that all the Penal Laws that were lately in force against us, and with such rigour executed upon us, ought not to be call'd Punishments, or said to have any such thing as Sharpness in them, of which enough hath been said before.

The Conclusion.

WE are now come to the Conclusion of your *Discourse*, and the Page 177. Defence you have made of it, where you tell me, *That tho' you have hitherto paid me a very nice Attendance, yet you can't part with me without some farther Remarks on my Way of Writing.* And here you found five things to make your Learned Remarks upon.

1. *A vain Ostentation of Learning where there was no need of it.* The truth is, I found nothing in your *Discourse of Schism*, that needed any great Learning to confute it; but wherein my vain Ostentation did appear, I cannot tell. *The Scraps of Logick* you upbraid me with, I think every one that understands the Rules of a Regular Disputation, will say, was necessary to discover the Fallacy of your looser way of Arguing, and wherein you ought to have sav'd me the labour, and for which, no wise Man that ever was bred in an *University*, would have despis'd you. But the true Reason why you are now so offended with a *Syllogism*, is evident enough: It seems, as great an Enemy as you are to the *Sectaries*, you can decry *Humane Learning* too, when you are gall'd by it. And as for that approv'd Maxim which I had occasion to mention, that *Ens* and *Unum* are convertible Terms, if you can't understand it, or the Relation it had to my Argument, I can't help your Understanding, any better than my plain words there might have done it, where I told you, that our being *One* with you in every thing, wherein the *Essence* of the Catholick Christian Unity doth consist, is sufficient to denominate us to be *One* with you, tho' we be Divided from you in some
of

of the External and Accidental Circumstantials, wherein the *Essence* of the Unity doth not consist. If this be not intelligible enough to you, I must despair of being understood by you.

And altogether as unhappy, you say, I am, in attempting to shew my Skill in Anatomy. Which indeed was far enough from my Design, only I occasionally mentioned the Livers preparing the Blood for the Nourishment of its own proper *Parenchyma*. But you tell me, *The Liver hath no such Faculty, as I have assign'd to it.* Sir, If you will but bear with this little piece of Vanity you now provoke me to, I might tell you, That for the space of very nigh these Thirty Years past, wherein I have studied, and by Colledge-Licence practiced Physick, perhaps I have read as much in Anatomy, as ever you have done, and know both the Ancient and Modern Anatomists Opinions in this matter, and know too how little the Learned of this Faculty are agreed on that Question. But it being out of my way at present, to offer my Reader any part of an Anatomy-Lecture, I shall only recommend it to you, as a Service that would highly merit the immortal Fame of a *Vertuoso*, if you would please to communicate to the Learned World, your more curious and certain discovery of what the particular Office of that Bowel is, and how far it is concern'd in the Business of *Sanguification*.

2. Another little Pique you have at me is, for my saying, *That the Passover, and the*
 Page 179. *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, were the same Ordinance; Which, you say, at first sight appears too absurd to need any Confutation.* However it appear'd to you at first sight, had you not been too hasty, second thoughts might have been wiser. Did I not plainly tell you how far they were the same, *viz.* of the same Divine Institution, of the same Signification and Mystery, that is, as
 repre-

representing Christ Crucified, and equally Sacred, tho' of different Forms and Circumstantial, and if this had been false or absurd, as you say, why had you not shewn where the Fallacy or Absurdity lies?

3. You accuse me for *calling Names*, when *Arguments were expected*: And the only Name you can charge me for, is that of *Tantray*. By whom this Name was first devised, I cannot tell, but you know how commonly That, and the *Trimming*, have pass'd of late by way of distinction between the more Violent, and the more Moderate, of the Church-men; and finding you such a One as the Name agreed to, I was, tho' perhaps too unmannerly bold, to salute you with it, and for which I would humbly beg your Pardon, if that would reclaim you from what was the meriting cause of it. But then when you tell us, *That the Design of the Test-Act was to be a Fence to keep (you do not say Papists, but) Us, Protestants, out of your Communion.* Whatever there be of Truth in this, I think you have said but little for the Honour of that Act.

4. You complain of a great want of Sincerity in my management of the Controversy with you: And particularly, because I did not refer to the Pages of your Book, by Marginal Notes; which indeed I thought not needful, while I followed you as your Shadow, by your Sections and Paragraphs, as I have already told you. Nor could I be so silly as to think that that would prevent our being compar'd together, tho' you are so weak as to say so. Neither did I wilfully vary any Form of your words in the least Tittle of them, nor conceal'd any thing that had any Pretence of Argument in it, which was that I all along most attentively sought for, tho' this be, in several Instances, the unfair dealing you have now us'd with me. But as for the Fairness of my

N

dealing

dealing with you in these respects, I willingly appeal to any Indifferent Reader.

5. Lastly, You tell me for a *Fling at parting*, as you truly call it, *how little regard I have for the Truth*, that is, how great a *Liar* I am, because I told you at *Page 59.* of my *Letter*, what the Natural Consequences of your Arguings were, of which, you say, *that I my self did not believe a word, especially because you had somewhere declar'd the contrary*; but what then? Did I not believe that these were the Consequences of your Arguings? And this you charge on me as a self-contradiction, whereas the Contradiction lies wholly on your own side. 'Tis a very common thing for Men, to hold an Error, and yet disown the necessary Consequences of it; and so it hath now befallen you; I did but shew you your own Face in the Glass of your Argumentations, and with this you are offended, and disown your own Image, and call me *Liar* for but holding up the Glass to you, that you might behold your own Features in the true Colour, and Demensions of them.

Now, for the Satisfaction of my Reader, I shall draw out the bare *Skeleton*, or some of the Particular Questions of the Controversy that is between us, in these Eight Things.

1. Whether Separation, as to Outward Communion in Ceremonies and Circumstantials, by such whose Consciences are not satisfy'd concerning the Lawfulness of the Use of them, while Unity in the True Christian Faith is retain'd, be Schismatical and inconsistent with the Catholick Church-Union? This you *Affirm*, and I *Deny*.

2. Whether Church-Rulers have an equal Power in Unnecessary Ceremonies, as in the Necessary Circumstances of Divine Worship? This also you *Affirm*, and I *Deny*.

3. Whether

3. Whether that which is Lawful and Necessary at Some times, and under some Circumstances, may not at other times, and under other Circumstances, be Sinful? This you *Deny*, and I *Affirm*.

4. Whether Things in their own Nature Indifferent, being introduc'd into the Worship of God, and commanded by Church-Rulers, do meerly by vertue of such Command, become Necessary? This you *Affirm*, and I *Deny*.

5. Whether the Real and Invincible Doubts of a Person's Conscience, concerning the Lawfulness of some Things, which are requir'd in order to Outward Communion with a Church, will justify his Separating, so far, from that Church? This you *Deny*, and I *Affirm*.

6. Whether the Power that a Church hath to lay aside some Ceremonies and Humane Rites, doth imply an equal Power of setting up others in their room? This you *Affirm*, and I *Deny*.

7. Whether Episcopacy and Presbytery be Two distinct Orders and Offices, and not differing only in Degree? This you *Affirm*, and I *Deny*.

8. Whether Ordination by meer Presbyters be valid, according to the Holy Scriptures, and the Practice of the Primitive Churches? This you *Deny*, and I *Affirm*.

And now, Sir, after all the mighty Cry that hath been made against the Sin of *Schism*, and all the Pamphlets and Books that have been written about it, both on One side, and the Other; and it being certain and undenyable that there are *Contentions*, *Divisions*, *Separations*, and *Animosities* amongst us, which deserve no softer Name than *Schismatical*.

Ἐρεῖς, ζήλοι, θυμὸς, ἐριβία, καὶ ἀλαλία, τὸ θυροισμὸς, φθισαίς, ἀκαταστάσις, 2 Cor. 12. 20. It appears to be very reasonable and necessary now to enquire, not so much what *Schism* is, but who are the *Schismatics*, or on whose Heads this Guilt must be laid? *Schism* is a

Sin of so ill a Name, that every one abhors the Imputation of it; nor is it my Design to palliate, or lessen the Crime, on whomsoever it shall truly fall.

1. Then it is most certain, that those that cause the Schism are the Schismatics. *Causa non secessio facit Schismaticum.* Mark them which cause Divisions contrary to the Doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them, Rom. 16. 17. But that it is the Imposition of Unnecessary and Offensive Rites and Ceremonies of Humane Invention, that is the true Cause of our Divisions and Schisms, is too notorious to be deny'd; 'Tis not the bare Using but the Imposing them on others that makes the Schism. When should we have fallen out about Ceremonies, had they as Indifferent things been left to be us'd Indifferently, or disus'd, as every one is satisfy'd in his own mind about them, according to the Freedom and Liberty of the Gospel; *In una fide nihil officit diversa Consuetudo*: "But when Men will have an Unity not of God's making, but of their own, it falls out (says the Polb. Disc of Schism, P. 8. "Excellent Mr. Polhill) as when a piece of New Cloth is put to an Old Garment, there is a σχίσμα, a Rent made, the Humane thing that did seem to fill up the Churches Unity, doth make a breach in it. 'Tis true, if there were no Refusing to Conform to the Impositions, there would be no Schism in Outward Communion; but were there no Imposing, there would be no occasion for this Refusing: So that 'tis on the Imposition that the Guilt must ly, unless it could be prov'd, that the Matter of the Imposition is of Divine Institution, and necessary to Salvation, or to the right and acceptable Worshipping of God; but where the things impos'd are in their own Nature Unnecessary, and in their use lyable to the Doubts and Scruples

Scruples of truly tender Consciences, these are the true Causes of the Divisions and Schisms that are the Consequents of them. Those that Refuse Conformity to what their Consciences do really doubt of, must so refuse, or wilfully Sin against God; but to lay aside the Ceremonies, or not to impose them, is acknowledged, that it may be done without Sin; therefore 'tis the Imposing of them, and not the Refusing Conformity to them, that is the true Cause of the Schism that is occasion'd by them. But those that cause the Schism are the Schismatics.

2. *Those whose Courses tend to the overthrowing of the Church are the Schismatics.* Those that build a House upon the Sand, or an uncertain sinking Foundation, are the Causes of all the Cracks that are thereby occasion'd, and of the falling of the Parts asunder. Now 'tis the Pure Doctrine of the Gospel, that is the Rock, on which the Church of Christ is built, and which alone is permanent, and always the same, but whatsoever is of Humane Device and Institution, is but as the Sand, or sinking Foundation, on which there can be no sure Building. And this is what the Experience of all the past Ages of the Church doth teach us. 'Twas Superstition that laid the First Foundation of all the Fallen Churches Degeneracy and Apostacy. The more there was us'd of Men's *Hay and Stubble and Wood*, the more of the Mixture of Men's Inventions with God's Institutions, the weaker the Building was; nor hath there been any one thing in the Church more productive of Schisms and Divisions than this. But those that endeavour to reform a Church, by reducing it to the Rules of the Holy Scriptures, are they that strengthen the Church, and preserve the Unity and Peace of it, holding fast that wherein its Unity doth consist: And therefore whatever Oppositions they may

N 3

meet

meet with from some Men, and what Contentions soever may, by the Ignorance, Prejudices, or Lusts of Men, be occasion'd by it, those are not the Schismatics, but the true Friends and Builders of the Church.

3. *Those that do uncharitably and unjustly cut off their Brethren as no parts of the Church of Christ, for refusing to Conform to their Rites and Ceremonies, or to receive their Doubtful Opinions, are the Schismatics:* These are the *Concision* that divide the Church, who cut off from its Communion such as Christ hath not by any Law of his cut off. Thus did the *Novatians* condemn all others besides themselves, as no Churches of Christ. So the *Donatists* held that the true Church was only *in parte Donati*. And the *Papists*, that the Church is only *in parte Papæ*, and the Protestants they will not so much as own to be Christians. And is not this your very Doctrine, I do not say the Doctrine of the Church of England, but yours, that those are cut off from the Catholick Church, and from any Vital Visible Union with it, that are not *in parte Episcoporum*: And for this reason you will have no Communion with us in any Acts of Religious Worship, unless it be in your own Way, but condemn it, as a great Sin to be seen in any of our Assemblies, and that with a far greater Detestation than you have against the *Papists*. But for our parts, we abhor, and declare against all such Uncharitableness towards you: The Church of England we own for a true Church of Christ, and take it as our greatest Affliction that we are thus shut out of its Communion by you, without any just Cause, but because we can't see with your Eyes; nor judge in some things, which are of highest Concernment to us, as you do; nor give up the Conduct of our Souls to any that shall but be set over us, or that can make the best Friends for a Benefice, how Ignorant,

norant, or Scandalous soever they be. Who are the *Schismatics* then, they that receive the wrong, or they that offer it? Those that are without Cause cast out, or those that do so cast and keep them out? So that if the *Novatians*, the *Donatists*, the *Papists*, were justly condemn'd for *Schismatics*, so are you who deal with us after the same manner.

4. Those who set up Conditions of Communion of their own devising, which is not a Unity of God's making, but of their own, these are the *Schismatics*.

"Who will have a Surplice, Polb. Disc. of Schism, p. 72. &c.
 "or no Preaching; a Cross, or no
 "Baptizing; a Kneeling Posture, or
 "no Lord's-Supper. But he that makes the first

Inclosure of the Common, says the Learned Bishop *Stillingfleet*, makes the *Schism*. "Where any

"Error or Doubtful Point of Doctrine is requir'd
 "to be believ'd and practiced, as the necessary

"Conditions of Communion with a Church, it
 "makes with-drawment from it to be so far ne-

"cessary, because we cannot therein Communicate
 "with it, without Sin. For Men not to forsake

"the belief of Errours, supposing them to be such,
 "is impossible; and not to forsake the Practice and

"Profession of them, upon such belief, were the
 "highest Hypocrisy; and to do so, and not to for-

"sake the Communion of the Church, where these
 "are own'd, were apparently Contradictions —

"Those that require unlawful and unnecessary Con-

"ditions of Communion, must take the Imputation
 "of Schism upon themselves, by making Separation

"from them just and necessary. So
 says Bishop *Stillingfleet*, out of Mr. *Chillingworth*.

"So that, (as Mr. *Chillingworth* there goes on) "either
 "you must free your Church from the requiring
 "the belief of any Error, Damnable, or not Dam-

nable;

able; or whether you will or no, must free us
 from Schism. And in the *First Preface*
Preface, to the Author of Charity Maintain'd, speak-
 ing to the *Papist*, says thus, 'That not
 Protestants for Rejecting, but the Church
 of *Rome* for Imposing upon the Faith of Christians,
 Doctrines unwritten and unnecessary, and for di-
 sturbing the Churches Peace, and dividing Unity
 for such Matters, is in a high degree Presumptuous
 and Schismatical. And what he says of the Church
 of *Rome*, is altogether as true of any other Church,
 that doth the same thing. But such are some of the
 Articles of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*,
 particularly those that respect Rites and Ceremo-
 nies, and which are not only Dogmatical, but
 Practical. Again, says that Reverend
William Iren. Prelate, 'Where any Church, retaining
 P. 117. 'Purity of Doctrine, doth require the
 owning of, and conforming to any
 unlawful, or suspected Practice, Men may lawfully
 deny Conformity to, and Communion with that
 Church in such things, without incurring the
 Guilt of Schism. Did that justify our withdraw-
 ing from them, *i. e.* the Church of *Rome*, because
 they requir'd things unlawful, as Conditions of
 Communion, and will not the same justify other
 Mens Nonconformity in things supposed by them
 unlawful? Again, If it be said, that Men are
 bound to be rul'd by their Governours, in deter-
 mining what things are Lawful, and what not:
 To this it is answered, No true Protestant can
 Swear blind Obedience to Church-Governours in
 all things. It is the highest Usurpation to rob
 Men of the Liberty of their Judgments. That
 which we plead for against the *Papists* is, That
 all Men have Eyes in their Heads as well as the
 Pope, that every one hath a *judicium privatae dis-*
cretionis, which is the Rule of Practice as to him-
 self;

' self; And tho' we freely allow a Ministerial
 ' Power under Christ in the Governours of the
 ' Church, yet that extends not to an Obligation
 ' upon Men, to go against the Dictates of their own
 ' Reason and Conscience. I then enquire who must
 ' be Judge, what things are Lawful in this Case,
 ' what not? If the Governours, then the Power
 ' will be Absolute; for to be sure, what they com-
 ' mand, they will say is Lawful, either in it self, or
 ' as they command it. If every Private Person will
 ' judge what is Lawful, and what not, which is
 ' commanded, (as, when all is said, every Man
 ' will be his own judge in this case, in things con-
 ' cerning his own Welfare,) then is he no fur-
 ' ther bound to obey, than he judgeth the thing to
 ' be Lawful which is commanded. The Plea of an
 ' Erroneous Conscience takes not off the Obligation
 ' to follow the Dictates of it; for as he is bound to
 ' lay it down, supposing it to be Erroneous, so he
 ' is bound not to go against it, while it is not laid
 ' down. In those Schisms which concern Fact, says
 ' the Learned and Judicious Mr. *Hales*,
 ' nothing can be a just cause of refusing *Hales Schif.*
 ' Communion, but only the requiring *p. 8.*
 ' the execution of some Unlawful, or
 ' Suspected Act; For not only in Reason, but in
 ' Religion too, that Maxim admits of no release,
 ' *Cautissimi cujusq; praeceptum quod dubitas ne feceris.*
 ' And then he instances in the Schism about Image-
 ' Worship, determined by the Second Council of
 ' *Nice*, in which he pronounceth the Schismatical
 ' Party to be the Synod it self; and that, 1. Be-
 ' cause it is acknowledg'd by all to be a thing Un-
 ' necessary. 2. It is by most Suspected. 3. It is
 ' by many held Unlawful.

And then as for Schism, as it is a breach of Chri-
 stian Love and Charity, and consequently of the
 Peace and quiet of the Church, it must in the Suffrage
 of

of all the World, lye at your Doors, who are the First Aggressors, not only in Imposing these Burdens upon us, but in Condemning and Reviling us as Schismaticks, and persecuting us, as you did while it was in your Power, for no other Cause, but for our not complying with you, against the invincible Sentiments of our own Consciences: Let the Guilt of the Schisms you complain of, lye on their Heads that have caused them, and then you may declaim against it, till you are weary.

But to heal all these Breaches, and to restore and preserve the Peace of the Church, if there may yet be any hope, I know no properer Remedy than what that Learned and Reverend Prelate in his *Irenicum* hath propos'd.

1. That nothing be impos'd as necessary, but what is clearly reveal'd in the Word of God.

2. That nothing be requir'd or determin'd, but what is sufficiently known to be Indifferent in its own Nature, and that both in the Sense of the Primitive and of the Reformed Churches.

3. That whatever is thus determined, be in order only to a due Performance of what is in general requir'd in the Word of God, and not to be look'd on as any part of Divine Worship or Service.

4. That no Sanctions be made, nor Mults or Penalties inflicted on such, who only dissent from the use of some things, whose Lawfulness they at present scruple, till sufficient Time and Means be used for their Information of the Nature and Indifferency of the things, that it may be seen whether it be out of willful Contempt and Obstinacy of Spirit, or only Weakness of Conscience, and dissatisfaction concerning the things themselves, that they disobey.

5. That Religion be not clog'd with Ceremonies, which do but eat out the Heart, Heat, Life and Vigour of Christianity.

And

And according to the Judicious *Chillingworth*; ' Let all Men believe the Scripture, and that only, and endeavour to believe it in the true Sense, and require no more of others; and they shall find this not only a better, but the only means to suppress Heresie, and restore Unity. For he that believes the Scripture sincerely, and endeavours to believe it in the true Sense, cannot possibly be an Heretick. And if no more than this were requir'd of any Man, to make him capable of the Churches Communion, then all Men, so qualify'd, tho' they were different in Opinion, yet notwithstanding any such Difference, must be of necessity One in Communion. To which I will now add but this one more, *That Indifferent things, that is, which are so both in their Nature and Use, be left, both as to Judgment and Practice, in their Indifferency.* As that fierce Contention about the *May-pole* was calmly and prudently decided, to the Content of both the Contending Parties. Those that are for a *May-pole*, shall have a *May-pole*, and those that are for no *May-pole*, shall have no *May-pole*. This I think would do much better Service, than any Attempts you have hitherto made towards it, and wherein if you judge it fit to persevere, I promise you (as perhaps you will think it to be but good Manners in me) to give you the last word, who am

S I R,

Feb. 26. 170 $\frac{1}{2}$.

Your Humble Servant

S. S.

Some

(184)
Some Books Printed for *J. Robinson* at the
Golden Lion in *St. Paul's Church-yard*.

In Folio.

A Nnotations on the Bible, by *Mr. Poole*, in 2
Vol. The 4th Edition.

The Works of *Thomas Manton*, D. D. in five
Volumes.

The Works of *Thomas Goodwin*, D. D. in four
Volumes.

The Works of *Bishop Hopkins*, in one Volume.

The Works of *William Bates*, D. D. in one large
Volume.

Expository Notes and Practical Observations on
the Four Evangelists. By *William Burkitt*, M. A.

— Likewise on all the Epistles, now in the
Press.

Josephus his History of the *Jews*, newly revised,
and lately reprinted.

A Compleat History of the Reformed Churches
in *France*, with a large Account of their Sufferings
and Destitution. In 2 Volumes.

A Compleat Journal of the House of Lords and
Commons in *Queen Elizabeth's* Reign. By *Sir Symon D'Ewes*.

Annotations on the Old Testament. By *Samuel
Clark*, M. A.

Archbishop Usher's Life and Letters, published
By *Dr. Parre*.

The Life of *Mr. Richard Baxter*, written by
himself. With an Account of the Times he lived in.

In

Books Printed for J. Robinson.

In Quarto.

A Nnotations on the New Testament. By *Samuel Clark*, M. A.

— His Survey of the Bible, or an Analytical Account of the Holy Scriptures.

A Body of Divinity, or the Sum and Substance of Christian Religion, &c. By the most Reverend *James Usher* late Archbishop of *Armagh*. With a large and new Account of his Life.

An Exposition and Practical Observations on *Ecclesiastes*. By *A. Nisbet*.

The Conformists Plea for the Nonconformists. In 4 Parts. By *Edward Peirce* late Rector of *Cottesbrook* in *Northamptonshire*.

In Octavo.

A LL the Works of *John Edwards*, D. D. in Ten Volumes, viz. On the Authority, Style and Perfection of the Holy Scriptures, and explaining several difficult Texts, and several Defences of the Holy Trinity against the *Socinians*, &c.

The Living Temple, or a Design'd Improvement of that Notion, that a Good Man is the Temple of God. In two Volumes. By *John How*, M. A.

Sacramental Discourses on several Texts Before and After the Lord's Supper. in two Volumes. Wherein several Cases of Conscience are resolv'd. By *John Shower*.

Consolations against the Fears of Death; with Seasonable Directions how to prepare our selves to Dye Well. By Mr. *Drelincourt*. The Fourth Edition.

An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer, with several Sermons. By *Ez. Hopkins* late Lord Bishop of *London-Derry*.

A

Books Printed for J. Robinson.

A Vindication of the Truth of the Christian Religion. By *James Abbadie*, D. D.

Gemitus Sanctorum. Some Sermons on Rom. 7. 24, 25. By *S. Stoddon*.

Genuine Remains of the late Pious and Learned *John Lightfoot*, D. D.

The Christians Race and Patience. 14 Sermons on Heb. 12. By *Matthew Silvester*, V. D. M.

A Discourse on Natural and Reveal'd Religion. By *S. Nye*.

———His Discourse on the Trinity.

———His Defence of the Canon of the New Testament, against *Toland's Amyntor*.

A Discourse on Divine Perfection. By *William Bates*, D. D. being the last Book published before his Death.

A Twofold Discourse of Man's Enmity against God, and Reconciliation with God. By *John How*, M. A.

A Discourse of Conversion, shewing the Nature of it, and giving Directions about it. By a Person of Quality.

A Sermon at the Funeral of the Reverend Mr. *Samuel Clark*, Author of the Annotations on the Bible. By *S. C. V. D. M.* With a Sermon of his on account of the late Peace.

The New State of *England*, under our Present Sovereign Queen *Ann*; With an Account of the Present Establishment both in Church and State, to September 1702.

The Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures Vindicated: With a Discourse concerning the Testimony of the Spirit. By *S. Clark*, M. A.

An Abridgment of Mr. *Baxter's* History of his Life and Times. With an Account of those Worthy Ministers who were ejected in 1662.

Their Apology for themselves and their Adherents; Containing the Grounds of their Nonconformity;

Books Printed for J. Robinson.

formity, and Practice, as to Stated and Occasional Communion with the Church of *England*. And a Continuation of their History till the Year 1691. By *Edmund Calamy*.

Two Discourses, (1) Of the Punishment of Sin in Hell. (2) Proving a State of Glory for the Spirits of Just Men, immediately at the death of their Bodies. By *Thomas Goodwin, D. D.*

In Duodecimo.

PReparation for Death, &c. By *Ed. Pearse*.

—His Best Match, or the Souls Espousal to Jesus Christ.

An Explanation of the Assemblies Catechism for the help of Children. Price 6 d. stich'd.

A Present for Children; Giving an account of many Excellent things uttered by three young Children: With a Seasonable Exhortation to Parents for the Education of their Children. By a Person of Quality.

The Epitome of the Bible in Verse.

The Poor Doubting Christian drawn to Christ: With Helps to recover God's Favour. By *T. Hooker*.

A Discourse of Hardness of Heart, &c. By *Increase Matther*, Minister in *New-England*.

The Altogether a Christian.

The Character of a Virtuous Wife. Both by *J. Foxcraft, M. A.*

The Worthy Communicant. Shewing the due Order of Receiving the Lord's Supper. By *J. Dyke*.

Hearts Ease: Or a Sovereign Remedy against all Troubles. By *J. B.*

The Barren Fig-Tree: Or the Doom and Down-fall of the Fruitless Professor. By *John Bunyan*.

The Mothers Catechism: Or a Familiar Way of Catechizing Children. By the late Reverend Mr. *R. Baxter*. Published by Mr. *Silvester*.

Helps

Books Printed for J. Robinson.

Helps for Faith and Patience in Times of Affliction. By *J. Burdwood* late Minister in *Dartmouth*.
Correction, Instruction; or a Treatise of Affliction. By *Tbo. Case*, M. A.

Several Sermons for Reformation of Manners.

The Psalms of *David*, and other Hymns in Meter, fitted to the common Tunes. By the late Reverend Mr. *Richard Baxter*.

A Brief Concordance to the Holy Bible, of the most usual and useful Places which one may have occasion for. Price 2 s. By *Samuel Clark*, M. A.

The Pastor's Charge, and the People's Duty. By *Samuel Stoddon*.

A Discourse of Closet (or Secret) Prayer. By *Samuel Slater*.

A Short and Plain Exposition of the *Revelations*. By a French Divine.

The Almost a Christian. By the late Right Reverend *Ez. Hopkins*, late Lord Bishop of *London-Derry*.

Bishop *Burnet's* Tracts, viz. his Travels into *Italy*, &c. in 2 Volumes.

——His Translation of *Lactantius*, against Persecution.

Now in the Press.

A Practical Exposition of the whole 53 Chapters of *Isaiab*. By the late Reverend *Thomas Manton*, D.D. Published by Mr. *Harris*.

Holy Emulation urged. Or Arguments and Motives for Christians to Excel in Holiness. By *R. Evans* Minister in *Devon*.

An History of the Apostle's Creed, with Critical Observations on the several Articles thereof. The Second Edition.

F I N I S.